arXiv:1005.2007v1 [math.LO] 12 May 2010

Wellfoundedness proofs by means of non-monotonic inductive definitions II: first order operators

Toshiyasu Arai
Graduate School of Science, Chiba University
1-33, Yayoi-cho, Inage-ku, Chiba, 263-8522, JAPAN

Nov. 23, 2005

Abstract

In this paper, we give two proofs of the wellfoundedness of recursive notation systems for Π_N-reflecting ordinals. One is based on Π^0_{N-1}-inductive definitions, and the other is based on distinguished classes.

1 Introduction

This is a sequel to our [8]. In [8] we proved the wellfoundedness of recursive notation systems for reflecting ordinals up to Π_3-reflection by relevant inductive definitions.

Let $\mathrm{KP}\Pi_N\,(3 < N < \omega)$ denote a set theory whose intended models are L_π with Π_N-reflecting ordinals π. It is easy to see that $\mathrm{KP}\Pi_N$ proves that any Π^0_{N-1}-inductive definition eventually reaches to a closed point. We have designed a recursive notation system $Od(\Pi_N)$ of ordinals so that the order type of its countable fragment is the proof-theoretic ordinal of $\mathrm{KP}\Pi_N$. An element of the notation system is called an *ordinal diagram*. One half of this result was accomplished by cut-elimination in [7]. The other was to show that $\mathrm{KP}\Pi_N$ proves the wellfoundedness of $Od(\Pi_N)$ up to each countable ordinal in it

In this paper, we give two proofs of the wellfoundedness. One is based on Π^0_{N-1}-inductive definitions, and the other is based on distinguished classes. Proof theoretic study for Π_N-reflecting ordinals via ordinal diagrams $Od(\Pi_N)$ will be reported in a forthcoming paper [7].

Ord denotes the class of ordinals. Π^0_n denotes the arithmetical hierarchy on ω, while Π_n the Lévy hierarchy on sets.

Definition 1.1 (Richter-Aczel [11])

1. By an *operator* we mean any function Γ on $\mathcal{P}(\omega)$.

2. An operator Γ determines a transfinite sequence $(\Gamma^x : x \in Ord)$ of subsets of ω, where $\Gamma^x = \bigcup\{\Gamma(\Gamma^y) : y < x\}$. The *closure ordinal* $|\Gamma|$ of Γ is the least ordinal x such that $\Gamma^{x+1} = \Gamma^x$. The set *defined by* Γ is $\Gamma^\infty = \Gamma^{|\Gamma|}$.

3. An operator Γ is said to be Π^0_n if $\{(n, X) \in \omega \times \mathcal{P}(\omega) : n \in \Gamma(X)\}$ is defined by a Π^0_n-formula.

4. For operators Γ_0, Γ_1 let

$$n \in [\Gamma_0, \Gamma_1](X) :\Leftrightarrow n \in \Gamma_0(X) \lor [\Gamma_0(X) \subseteq X \,\&\, n \in \Gamma_1(X)].$$

5. Let Φ_0, Φ_1 be classes of formulae. An operator Γ is said to be $[\Phi_0, \Phi_1]$ if $\Gamma = [\Gamma_0, \Gamma_1]$ for some $\Gamma_i \in \Phi_i \, (i < 2)$.

6. For $n \in \Gamma^\infty$ its *norm* $|n|_\Gamma$ (relative to Γ) is the least ordinal x such that $n \in \Gamma^{x+1} (\leftrightarrow n \in \Gamma(\Gamma^x))$.

Let L(PA) denote the language of Peano arithmetic. Variables in L(PA) are denoted by $n, m, \ldots$.

Definition 1.2 Let Φ be one of the classes $\Pi^0_n, [\Pi^0_n, \Pi^0_m] \, (n, m \in \omega)$. Then Φ-Fix denote a first order two-sorted thoery defined as follows. Its *language* L(Fix) is obtained from L(PA) by adding variables $x, y, \ldots$ for *ordinals*, and binary predicates $x = y, x < y$ (less than relation on ordinals) and *binary predicate* $n \in \Gamma^x$ for each $\Gamma \in \Phi$.

Axioms of the theory Φ-Fix are classified into four groups:

1. *Axioms* of PA in the language L(Fix) and equality axioms for either sort.

2. The *defining axioms* for $n \in \Gamma^x$: $n \in \Gamma^x \leftrightarrow \exists y < x[n \in \Gamma(\Gamma^y)]$.

3. Axioms for the well ordering $<$ on ordinals: $<$ is a linear ordering and *transfinite induction schema* for *any* formula $F \in$ L(Fix):

$$\forall x[\forall y < xF(y) \to F(x)] \to \forall x F(x).$$

4. *Closure axiom:* $\Gamma(\Gamma^\infty) \subseteq \Gamma^\infty$ for $\Gamma^\infty = \{n : \exists x(n \in \Gamma^x)\}$.

General Conventions. Let $(X, <)$ be a quasiordering. Let F be a function $F : X \ni \alpha \mapsto F(\alpha) \subseteq X$. For subsets $Y, Z \subset X$ of X and elements $\alpha, \beta \in X$, put

1. $\alpha \leq \beta \Leftrightarrow \alpha < \beta$ or $\alpha = \beta$.
2. $Y|\alpha = \{\beta \in Y : \beta < \alpha\}$.
3. $Y < Z :\Leftrightarrow \exists \beta \in Z \forall \alpha \in Y(\alpha < \beta)$.
4. $Z \leq Y :\Leftrightarrow \forall \beta \in Z \exists \alpha \in Y(\beta \leq \alpha)$.

5. $Y < \beta :\Leftrightarrow Y < \{\beta\}$; $\alpha < Z :\Leftrightarrow \{\alpha\} < Z$;
   $\beta \leq Y :\Leftrightarrow \{\beta\} \leq Y$; $Z \leq \alpha :\Leftrightarrow Z \leq \{\alpha\}$.

6. $F(Y) = \bigcup\{F(\alpha) : \alpha \in Y\}$.

7. $[\alpha, \beta] = \{\gamma \in X : \alpha \leq \gamma \leq \beta\}$. Open intervals (α, β) and half-open intervals $[\alpha, \beta), (\alpha, \beta]$ are defined similarly.

8. When $(X, <)$ is a linear ordering with its least element 0 and Y is a finite subset of X, $\max Y$ denotes the maximum of elements $\alpha \in Y$ with respect to the ordering $<$. If $Y = \emptyset$, then, by convention, set $\max \emptyset := 0$.

9. Let $X^{<\omega}$ denote the set of finite sequences on X. Then $<_{lex}$ denotes the *lexicographic ordering* on $X^{<\omega}$ with $\forall s \in X^n \forall t \in X^{n+1}(s <_{lex} t)$. If $<$ is a linear [well] ordering, then so is $<_{lex}$, resp.

In each system of ordinal diagrams the *Veblen function* $\varphi_\alpha(\beta) = \varphi\alpha\beta$ is built-in as a constructor so that $\varphi 0 \beta = \omega^\beta$. Natural numbers are defined from this as usual and denoted by i, j, k, l, m, n

Now let us mention the content of this paper.

In Section 2 we recall briefly the system Od of ordinal diagrams (abbreviated by o.d.'s) in [8]. The system Od is a super-system of all systems of o.d.'s considered in this paper.

Let Od' be a subsystem of Od which is closed under subdiagrams. The Section 3 is divied into two subsections. In the first subsection 3.1, following Setzer [12] and Buchholz [10] [1], we define sets $\mathcal{C}^\alpha(X) \subseteq Od'$ for $\alpha \in Od', X \subseteq Od'$. In the second subsection 3.2 we examine operators related to the sets. Almost all of these materials are reproduced from [8], and proofs are omitted.

In Section 4 we introduce a system $Od(\Pi_N)$ of o.d.'s for each positive integer $N \geq 4$.

The section is divided into seven subsections. The first four subsections are intended to give a set-theoretic interpretation of o.d.'s which is suggested by our wellfoundedness proof in [4] and in Section 6.

The first subsection 4.1 begins with defining iterations of Mahlo operations. These are intended to resolve a Π_N-reflecting universe. Since the resolving of Π_N-reflecting universes by iterations of Π_2-recursively Mahlo operations is so complicated, we first explain the simplest case in subsection 4.2. Namely Π_3-reflecting universe M_3^2 on Π_3-reflecting ordinals. The subsection consists in three subsubsections. In the first one 4.2.1 we define Mahlo classes to resolve M_3^2 by iterations of Π_2-recursively Mahlo operations. In the second one 4.2.2 we define the subsystem $Od(M_3^2) \subset Od$ of ordinal diagrams for M_3^2. In the third one 4.2.3 we prove the wellfoundedness of the countable fragment $Od(M_3^2)|\Omega$ by means of a $[\Pi_2^0, \Pi_2^0]$-inductive definition.

In subsection 4.3 we define Mahlo classes for Π_N-reflection, and in subsection 4.4 we associate Mahlo classes to o.d.'s in $Od(\Pi_N)$.

---

[1] In the previous article [8] , I attributed techniques on distinguished classes totally to Buchholz [10], some of which were actually developed by Setzer [12]. I have learned the fact from the review [13] of [8] written by Setzer.

In subsection 4.5 we define the system $Od(\Pi_N)$ of o.d.'s.

In subsection 4.6 a finer analysis of relations $\prec_i$ on $Od(\Pi_N)$ is given. The analysis inspires us about the ramification procedure in subsections 4.3 and 4.4, and enables us to prove the wellfoundedness in Sections 5 and 6.

In subsection 4.7 we introduce decompositions $\alpha(s)$ of ordinal diagrams α, where s denotes a function in ${}^{[i,k)}2\,(2 \leq i \leq k \leq N-3)$. In the next section 5 we define a suitable Π^0_{N-1}-operator Γ_N through the decompositions.

In Section 5 we prove the wellfoundedness of $Od(\Pi_N)|\Omega$ by means of a Π_{N-1}-inductive definition as an extension of [8].

In subsection 5.1 we define operators $\mathcal{G}_i\,(1 \leq i < N-1)$ on $Od(\Pi_N)$ recursively. Using these operators, a Π^0_{N-1}-operator Γ_N is defined. In subsection 5.2 we show the adequacy of the operator Γ_N. In subsection 5.3 we conclude the proof.

In Section 6 we show that $\mathrm{KP}\Pi_N$ does the same job, i.e., that for each $\alpha < \Omega$ in $Od(\Pi_N)$ $\mathrm{KP}\Pi_N$ proves that $(Od(\Pi_N)|\alpha, <)$ is a well ordering. The wellfoundedness proof is based on the *distinguished class* (in German: Ausgezeichnete Klasse) and is an extension of ones in [2], [3]. The proof is essentially the same given in [4].

In the first subsection 6.1 distinguished classes are defined and elementary facts on these classes are established. In the second subsection 6.2 we introduce several classes of Mahlo universes and establish key facts on these classes. This is a crux in showing $Od(\Pi_N)$ to be wellfounded without assuming the existence of the maximal distinguished class $\mathcal{W}_D$, which is Σ^1_2 on ω and hence a proper class in $\mathrm{KP}\Pi_N$. These classes imitate the ramification procedure described in subsections 4.3 and 4.4. In the third subsection 6.3 we conclude a proof of wellfoundedness of $Od(\Pi_N)$.

We rely on the previous [8], and state some lemmata without proofs since we gave proofs of these in [8]

2 The system *Od*

In this section let us recall briefly the system *Od* of ordinal diagrams (abbreviated by o.d.'s) in [8]. The system *Od* is a super-system of all systems of o.d.'s considered in this paper, and each of them is obtained by posing restrictions on the construction $(\sigma, \alpha, q) \mapsto d^q_\sigma \alpha$ in Definition 2.1.3.

Let $0, \Omega, \pi, +, \varphi, ^+$ and d be distinct symbols. Each o.d. in the system *Od* is a finite sequence of these symbols. φ is the binary Veblen function. Ω denotes the first recursively regular ordinal ω^{CK}_1. σ^+ denotes the next recursively regular ordinal to σ.

$\ell\alpha$ denotes the number of occurrences of symbols in the o.d. α. Let $sd(\alpha)$ denote the *set of proper subdiagrams* (subterms) of α. Thus $\alpha \notin sd(\alpha)$. Also put $sd^+(\alpha) = sd(\alpha) \cup \{\alpha\}$.

The set *Od* is classified into subsets $R = \{\pi\} \dot\cup \mathcal{D}^Q \dot\cup SR, SC, P$ according to the intended meanings of o.d.'s. P denotes the set of additive principal numbers, SC the set of strongly critical numbers and R the set of recursively regular ordinals. Ordinal diagrams are denoted $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \ldots$, while $\sigma, \tau, \ldots$ denote o.d.'s in the set R.

Let us reproduce generating clauses of o.d.'s not in [2].

Definition 2.1 *Od.*

1. $\sigma \in \mathcal{D}^Q \,\&\, 0 < k < \omega \Rightarrow \sigma^{+k} \in SR$.[2]

2. Let $\alpha \in Od \,\&\, \sigma \in \{\pi\} \cup SR = \{\Omega\} \cup \{\kappa^{+k} : \kappa \in \mathcal{D}^Q, k > 0\}$. Put $\eta := d_\sigma \alpha$ and define

   $$b(\eta) = \alpha, Q(\eta) = \emptyset, c(\eta) = \{\alpha\} \cup Q(\eta) = \{\alpha\}.$$

   Assume that the following condition is fulfilled:

   $$\mathcal{B}_{>\sigma}(\{\sigma\} \cup c(\eta)) < b(\eta) = \alpha \tag{1}$$

   Then $\eta = d_\sigma \alpha \in SC$.

3. Let $\alpha \in Od \,\&\, \sigma \in \{\pi\} \cup \mathcal{D}^Q \,\&\, q = \overline{j\kappa\tau\nu} \subseteq Od$, where $q = \overline{j\kappa\tau\nu}$ denotes a non-empty sequence of *quadruples* $j_m\kappa_m\tau_m\nu_m$ of length $l+1$ $(l \geq 0)$. Put $\eta := d_\sigma^q \alpha \in \mathcal{D}_\sigma^Q$ and define

   $$b(\eta) = \alpha, Q(\eta) = q = \{j_m, \kappa_m, \tau_m, \nu_m : m \leq l\}, c(\eta) = \{\alpha\} \cup Q(\eta).$$

   Assume that the condition (1) is fulfilled.

   Then $\eta = d_\sigma^q \alpha \in \mathcal{D}_\sigma^Q$.

$\mathcal{D}_\sigma$ denotes the set of diagrams of the form $d_\sigma^q \alpha$. $\alpha \prec \beta$ denotes the transitive closure of the relation $\{(\alpha, \beta) : \alpha \in \mathcal{D}_\beta\}$, and $\rho \prec \sigma \Leftrightarrow \tau \preceq \sigma$ for $\rho \in \mathcal{D}_\tau$. For any $\alpha \in Od$, set $\alpha < \pi^+ = \infty$ where $\pi^+ = \infty$ denotes an extra symbol not in Od.

Finite subsets of subdiagrams of o.d.'s α, $K^d\alpha \subseteq \mathcal{D} \cap sd^+(\alpha)$, $K\alpha \subseteq SC \cap sd^+(\alpha)$, $\mathcal{B}_\sigma(\alpha), \mathcal{B}_{>\sigma}(\alpha) \subseteq sd(\alpha)$ and $K_\sigma\alpha \subseteq sd^+(\alpha) \cap \mathcal{D}$ are defined as in [2], [8]. Specifically for $\alpha \in \mathcal{D}_\tau$

$$K_\sigma\alpha = \begin{cases} K_\sigma(\{\tau\} \cup c(\alpha)), & \text{if } \sigma < \tau \\ K_\sigma\tau, & \text{if } \tau < \sigma \,\&\, \tau \not\preceq \sigma \\ \{\alpha\}, & \text{if } \alpha \prec \sigma \end{cases}$$

Lemma 2.2 1. *$\alpha \prec \beta \Rightarrow \ell\beta < \ell\alpha \,\&\, \alpha < \beta$.*

2. *If $\beta \in K_\sigma\alpha$, then $\beta \prec \sigma$, β is a subdiagram of α and σ is a proper subdiagram of α.*

3. *$\alpha < \sigma \,\&\, K_\sigma\alpha < \beta \prec \sigma \Rightarrow \alpha < \beta$.*

---

[2] In proof-theoretic studies, i.e., cut-elimination in [5], [6] and [7] the construction $\sigma \mapsto \sigma^+$ is not needed. The construction helps us to define the system $Od(\Pi_N)$ smoothly.

4. $K_\sigma\alpha \leq \alpha$.

5. $\alpha \in \mathcal{D}_\sigma \,\&\, \kappa < \sigma \Rightarrow K_\kappa\alpha < \alpha$, *and* $\alpha \preceq \tau \in \mathcal{D}_\sigma \,\&\, \kappa < \sigma \Rightarrow K_\kappa\tau < \alpha$.

As in [5] we see the following lemma.

Lemma 2.3 *For* $\alpha, \beta, \tau \in Od$, $\alpha \leq \beta < \tau \Rightarrow \mathcal{B}_\tau(\alpha) \leq \mathcal{B}_\tau(\beta)$.

Lemma 2.4 *For* $\alpha, \beta \in Od$, $\alpha \prec \beta \in \mathcal{D} \Rightarrow b(\beta) < b(\alpha)$.

3 Sets $\mathcal{C}^\alpha(X)$ and operators

Let Od' be a subsystem of Od which is closed under subdiagrams: $\alpha \in Od' \Rightarrow sd(\alpha) \subseteq Od'$. $X, Y, \ldots$ ranges over subsets of Od'. In this section we define sets $\mathcal{C}^\alpha(X) \subseteq Od'$ for $\alpha \in Od', X \subseteq Od'$, and examine operators related to the sets.

Almost everything in this section is reproduced from [8], and omitted proofs of lemmata can be found there.

3.1 The sets $\mathcal{C}^\alpha(X)$

Following Setzer [12] and Buchholz [10] we define sets $\mathcal{C}^\alpha(X) \subseteq Od'$ for $\alpha \in Od', X \subseteq Od'$ as follows.

Definition 3.1 For $\alpha \in Od', X \subseteq Od'$, let

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{C}^\alpha(X) \quad := \quad & \text{closure of } \{0, \Omega, \pi\} \cup (X|\alpha) \text{ under } +, \varphi, \kappa \mapsto \kappa^+ \\ & \text{and } (\sigma, \alpha, q) \mapsto d_\sigma^q\alpha \text{ for } \sigma > \alpha \text{ in } Od' \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

Lemma 3.2 $X|\alpha = Y|\alpha \Rightarrow \mathcal{C}^\alpha(X) = \mathcal{C}^\alpha(Y)$ *and* $X \mapsto \mathcal{C}^\alpha(X)$ *is monotonic.*

Definition 3.3 Consider the following conditions for $X \subseteq Od'$:

(A) $\forall\alpha \in X[\alpha \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha(X)]$.

(K) $\forall\alpha \in X\forall\sigma[K_\sigma\alpha \subseteq X]$.

(KC) $\forall\alpha\forall\beta\forall\sigma[\alpha \in \mathcal{C}^\beta(X) \,\&\, \sigma \leq \beta \Rightarrow K_\sigma\alpha \subseteq X]$.

Lemma 3.4 *Assume* X *enjoys the condition* **(K)**. *Then* X *enjoys the condition* **(KC)**, *too.*

Lemma 3.5 *Assume* $X \subseteq Od'$ *enjoys the condition* **(A)**.

1. $\alpha \leq \beta \Rightarrow \mathcal{C}^\beta(X) \subseteq \mathcal{C}^\alpha(X)$.

2. $\alpha < \beta < \alpha^+ \Rightarrow \mathcal{C}^\beta(X) = \mathcal{C}^\alpha(X)$, *where* $\alpha^+ := \min\{\sigma \in R \cup \{\infty\} : \alpha < \sigma\}$.

Lemma 3.6 *Assume* $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha(X)$, $\alpha < \beta$ *and* $\forall\kappa \leq \beta[K_\kappa\gamma < \alpha]$.

1. *Assume* LIH: $\forall\delta[\ell\delta \leq \ell\gamma \,\&\, \delta \in \mathcal{C}^{\alpha}(X)|\alpha \Rightarrow \delta \in \mathcal{C}^{\beta}(X) \supseteq X|\alpha]$. *Then* $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}^{\beta}(X)$.
2. $\mathcal{C}^{\alpha}(X)|\alpha \subseteq X \Rightarrow \gamma \in \mathcal{C}^{\beta}(X)$.

Definition 3.7 An operator Γ on Od', i.e., $\Gamma : \mathcal{P}(Od') \to \mathcal{P}(Od')$ is said to be *persistent* if $\forall\alpha \in Od' \forall X, Y \subseteq Od'[X|\alpha = Y|\alpha \Rightarrow \Gamma(X)|(\alpha+1) = \Gamma(Y)|(\alpha+1)]$.

Definition 3.8 *1.* $\mathcal{G}(X) := \{\alpha : \alpha \in \mathcal{C}^{\alpha}(X) \,\&\, \mathcal{C}^{\alpha}(X)|\alpha \subseteq X\}$.

2. $R' := \{\alpha \in Od' : \mathcal{D}_{\alpha} \cap Od' \neq \emptyset\} \subseteq R$.
3. $\alpha \in \Gamma_2(X) :\Leftrightarrow \alpha < \pi \wedge \alpha \notin R' \wedge \alpha \in \mathcal{G}(X)$.

Lemma 3.9 *The operators* $\mathcal{G}$ *and* Γ_2 *are* Π^0_1 *and persistent.*

Lemma 3.10 *Assume* $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}^{\alpha}(X)$ *and* $\alpha \preceq \sigma$.

1. $\sigma \in \mathcal{C}^{\alpha}(X)$.
2. *If* $\alpha \in \mathcal{G}(X)$, *then* $\sigma \in \mathcal{C}^{\beta}(X)$ *for any* β *with* $\alpha \leq \beta \leq \sigma$.
3. *If* $\alpha \in \mathcal{G}(X)$ *and* $\sigma \in \mathcal{D}_{\tau}$, *then* $\sigma \in \mathcal{C}^{\beta}(X)$ *for any* β *with* $\alpha \leq \beta < \tau$.

Lemma 3.11 *Assume* $\bigcup\{K_{\sigma}\nu : \sigma \leq \kappa\} \subseteq X|\rho$. *Then* $\nu \in \mathcal{C}^{\kappa}(X)$.

Proof. We show, by induction on $\ell\gamma$,

$$\forall\gamma \in sd^{+}(\nu)[\bigcup\{K_{\sigma}\gamma : \sigma \leq \kappa\} \subseteq X|\rho \Rightarrow \gamma \in \mathcal{C}^{\kappa}(X)]$$

for the set of subdiagram $sd^{+}(\nu)$ of ν.

If $\gamma \notin \mathcal{D}$, then IH yields $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}^{\kappa}(X)$. Suppose $\gamma \in \mathcal{D}_{\tau} \,\&\, \bigcup\{K_{\sigma}\gamma : \sigma \leq \kappa\} \subseteq X|\rho$ with some $\{\tau\} \cup c(\gamma)$.

If $\tau > \kappa$, then IH yields $\{\tau\} \cup c(\gamma) \subseteq \mathcal{C}^{\kappa}(X)$, and hence we are done.

Suppose $\tau \leq \kappa$. By $\bigcup\{K_{\sigma}\gamma : \sigma \leq \kappa\} \subseteq X|\rho$ we have $\{\gamma\} = K_{\tau}\gamma \subseteq X|\rho \subseteq X|\kappa \subseteq \mathcal{C}^{\kappa}(X)$. □

Lemma 3.12 *Assume* X *enjoys the conditions* **(A)** *and* **(K)**. *Further assume* $\alpha \in \mathcal{G}(X)$ *and* $\alpha \prec \sigma$. *Then either* $\exists\delta \in X[\alpha \leq \delta \prec \sigma]$ *or* $\sigma \in \mathcal{G}(X)$.

Proof. Suppose $\neg\exists\delta \in X[\alpha \leq \delta \prec \sigma]$. We show $\sigma \in \mathcal{G}(X)$. $\sigma \in \mathcal{C}^{\sigma}(X)$ follows from Lemma 3.10.2. It remains to show $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}^{\sigma}(X)|\sigma \Rightarrow \gamma \in X$.
Case1 $\gamma < \alpha$: By Lemma 3.5.1 we have $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}^{\sigma}(X)|\alpha \subseteq \mathcal{C}^{\alpha}(X)|\alpha \subseteq X$.
Case2 $\gamma = \alpha$: By $\gamma = \alpha \prec \sigma$ we can assume $\gamma \in \mathcal{D}_{\kappa}$ for a $\kappa > \sigma$ with $\{\kappa\} \cup c(\gamma) \subseteq \mathcal{C}^{\sigma}(X)$. Then we would have $\kappa \preceq \sigma < \kappa$. This is not the case.
Case3 $\gamma > \alpha$: Then $\alpha < \gamma < \sigma$. Lemma 2.2.3 yields $\alpha \leq K_{\sigma}\gamma$.

On the other side, X enjoys the condition **(KC)** by Lemma 3.4. Thus $K_{\sigma}\gamma \subseteq X$. However $\delta \prec \sigma$ for any $\delta \in K_{\sigma}\gamma$ by Lemma 2.2.2. Therefore we would have $\exists\delta \in X[\alpha \leq \delta \prec \sigma]$. □

3.2 Families of sets in wellfoundedness proofs

Let $\theta[X]$ denote a (definable) property on subsets X of Od'. In this subsection some conditions on families of sets are extracted from wellfoundedness proofs, and we derive properties of sets under the conditions.

Definition 3.13 *1.* $\mathcal{W}_\theta := \bigcup\{X : \theta[X]\}$.

2. $\mathcal{G}_\theta := \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{W}_\theta)|\pi$.

Definition 3.14 *1.* $Prg[X, Y] :\Leftrightarrow \forall\alpha(X|\alpha \subseteq Y \,\&\, \alpha \in X \to \alpha \in Y)$.

2. For a definable class $\mathcal{X}$, $TI[\mathcal{X}]$ denotes the schema: $TI[\mathcal{X}] :\Leftrightarrow Prg[\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}] \to \mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{Y}$ holds for *any definable class* $\mathcal{Y}$.

3. For $X \subseteq Od'$ let WX denote the *wellfounded part* of X. WX is defined from the monotonic Π^0_1-operator (in X) $\Gamma_A(Y) := \{\alpha \in X : \forall\beta \in X|\alpha(\beta \in Y)\}$.

Consider the following conditions on the property θ:

(θ.0) $\mathcal{W}_\theta < \pi$.

(θ.1) $\forall\alpha \in X \exists Y \subseteq X\{\theta[X] \Rightarrow \theta[Y] \,\&\, \alpha \in \mathcal{G}(Y) \,\&\, X|\alpha = Y|\alpha\}$.

(θ.2) For any X with $\theta[X]$, $TI[X]$ and $\alpha \in X \Rightarrow \mathcal{W}_\theta|\alpha = X|\alpha$.

(θ.3) $\Gamma_2(\mathcal{W}_\theta) \subseteq \mathcal{W}_\theta$, i.e., $\forall\alpha < \pi[\alpha \notin R' \,\&\, \alpha \in \mathcal{G}_\theta \Rightarrow \alpha \in \mathcal{W}_\theta]$.

(θ.4) $\forall\alpha[\alpha \in SR \,\&\, \alpha \in \mathcal{G}_\theta \Rightarrow \alpha \in \mathcal{W}_\theta]$.

3.2.1 Elementary properties of the family of sets

Lemma 3.15 *Assume that θ enjoys hypotheses* **(θ.i)** *for $i \leq 1$. For any $X \in \{X : \theta[X]\} \cup \{\mathcal{W}_\theta\}$,*

1. $\forall\alpha \in X[\alpha \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha(X)]$, *and hence X enjoys the condition* **(A)** *in Definition 3.3.*

2. $\forall\tau[\alpha \in X \Rightarrow K_\tau\alpha \subseteq X]$.

3. $\forall\beta\forall\tau[\alpha \in \mathcal{C}^\beta(X) \Rightarrow K_\tau\alpha \subseteq \mathcal{C}^\beta(X)]$.

Hence X enjoys the conditions **(K)** *and* **(KC)** *in Definition 3.3.*

Lemma 3.16 *Assume that θ enjoys hypotheses* **(θ.i)** *for $i \leq 1$. For any $X \in \{X : \theta[X]\} \cup \{\mathcal{W}_\theta\}$, if $\alpha \in \mathcal{G}(X)$ and $\alpha \prec \sigma$, then either $\exists\delta \in X[\alpha \leq \delta \prec \sigma]$ or $\sigma \in \mathcal{G}(X)$.*

Proof. This follows from Lemma 3.12 with Lemmata 3.15.1 and 3.15.2. □

3.2.2 Hypotheses on wellfoundedness

Lemma 3.17 *Assume that θ enjoys hypotheses* $(\theta.\mathbf{i})$ *for* $i \leq 2$.

1. $TI[\mathcal{W}_\theta]$.
2. *For any* $X \in \{X : \theta[X]\} \cup \{\mathcal{W}_\theta\}$, $X \subseteq \mathcal{G}(X)$. *Hence* $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}^\beta(X)|\beta \,\&\, \beta \in X \Rightarrow \beta \in X$.
3. *Let* $X \in \{X : \theta[X]\} \cup \{\mathcal{W}_\theta\}$ *and assume* $(\theta.\mathbf{3})$ $\Gamma_2(X) \subseteq X$. *Then* $\forall \alpha < \pi[K\alpha \subseteq X \Rightarrow \alpha \in X]$.

Lemma 3.18 *Assume that θ enjoys hypotheses* $(\theta.\mathbf{i})$ *for* $i \leq 3$. *Then*

$$WOd'|\Omega = \mathcal{W}_\theta|\Omega.$$

Definition 3.19 Set

$$\mathcal{W}_\pi = \mathcal{C}^\pi(\mathcal{W}_\theta).$$

Lemma 3.20 *Assume that θ enjoys hypotheses* $(\theta.\mathbf{i})$ *for* $i \leq 4$.

1. $\mathcal{W}_\theta \subseteq \mathcal{W}_\pi$ *and* $\mathcal{W}_\pi|\pi = \mathcal{W}_\theta|\pi$.
2. $\pi \in \mathcal{W}_\pi$.
3. $\alpha \in \mathcal{W}_\pi \Leftrightarrow K^d\alpha \subseteq \mathcal{W}_\pi \Leftrightarrow K^d\alpha \subseteq \mathcal{W}_\theta$.
4. $\alpha \in \mathcal{W}_\pi \Rightarrow K_\sigma\alpha \subseteq \mathcal{W}_\theta \,\&\, \alpha \in \mathcal{C}^\beta(\mathcal{W}_\theta)$ *for any* σ *and* β.
5. *For each* $n \in \omega$, $TI[\mathcal{W}_\pi|\omega_n(\pi+1)]$ *with* $\omega_0(\alpha) = \alpha, \omega_{n+1}(\alpha) = \omega^{\omega_n(\alpha)}$.

Definition 3.21 For o.d.'s $\alpha \in Od'$ and finite sequences of quadruples $q \subseteq Od'$, define:

1. $$A(\alpha, q) :\Leftrightarrow \forall \sigma \in \mathcal{W}_\pi \forall \alpha_1 \in \mathcal{D}_\sigma[\alpha = b(\alpha_1) \,\&\, q = Q(\alpha_1) \Rightarrow \alpha_1 \in \mathcal{W}_\theta].$$
2. $$\mathrm{MIH}(\alpha) :\Leftrightarrow \forall \beta \in \mathcal{W}_\pi|\alpha \forall q \subseteq \mathcal{W}_\pi A(\beta, q).$$
3. $$\mathrm{SIH}(\alpha, q) :\Leftrightarrow \forall q_0 \subseteq \mathcal{W}_\pi[q_0 <_{lex} q \Rightarrow A(\alpha, q_0)],$$

   where sequences of quadruples $q = (j_m, \kappa_m, \tau_m, \nu_m : m \leq l)$ are arranged in the ordering: $q = (j_l, \kappa_l, \tau_l, \nu_l, \ldots, j_0, \kappa_0, \tau_0, \nu_0)$.

Lemma 3.22 *Assume that θ enjoys hypotheses* $(\theta.\mathbf{i})$ *for* $i \leq 4$. *Suppose* $\mathrm{MIH}(\alpha)$. *For any o.d.* $\beta \in Od'$

$$\beta \in \mathcal{C}^\sigma(\mathcal{W}_\theta) \,\&\, \mathcal{B}_{>\sigma}(\beta) < \alpha \Rightarrow \beta \in \mathcal{W}_\pi.$$

Theorem 3.23 *Assume that θ enjoys hypotheses* $(\theta.\mathbf{i})$ *for* $i \leq 4$. *Assume* $\{\alpha\} \cup q \subseteq \mathcal{W}_\pi$, $\mathrm{MIH}(\alpha)$, *and* $\mathrm{SIH}(\alpha, q)$ *in Definition 3.21. Then*

$$\forall \sigma \in \mathcal{W}_\pi \forall \alpha_1 \in \mathcal{D}_\sigma[\alpha = b(\alpha_1) \,\&\, q = Q(\alpha_1) \Rightarrow \alpha_1 \in \mathcal{G}_\theta].$$

3.3 Hypotheses on operators

Let Γ denote a first order operator on a subsystem Od' of Od. Let $\theta[X] :\Leftrightarrow \exists x \in Ord[X = \Gamma^x]$. Thus

Definition 3.24 *1.* $\mathcal{W} := \bigcup\{\Gamma^x : x \in Ord\}$.

2. $\mathcal{G} := \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{W})|\pi$.

3. $|\alpha| := |\alpha|_\Gamma$ for $\alpha \in \mathcal{W}$.

Consider the following conditions on Γ for any $X \in \{\Gamma^x : x \in Ord\} \cup \{\mathcal{W}\}$:

(Γ.0) $\Gamma(X) < \pi$.

(Γ.1) $\Gamma(X) \subseteq \mathcal{G}(X)$.

(Γ.2) $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{W} \,\&\, \alpha < \beta \Rightarrow |\alpha| < |\beta|$.

(Γ.3) $\Gamma_2(X) \subseteq \Gamma(X)$, i.e., $\forall\alpha < \pi[\alpha \notin R' \,\&\, \alpha \in \mathcal{G}(X) \Rightarrow \alpha \in \Gamma(X)]$.

(Γ.4) $\forall\alpha[\alpha \in SR \,\&\, \alpha \in \mathcal{G} \Rightarrow \alpha \in \mathcal{W}]$.

(Γ.5) $\Gamma(\mathcal{W}) \subseteq \mathcal{W}$.

Lemma 3.25 *Assume* Γ *enjoys the hypotheses* **(Γ.i)** *for* $i \leq 2$*. Then* $\theta[X] :\Leftrightarrow \exists x \in Ord[X = \Gamma^x]$ *enjoys* **(θ.i)** *for* $i \leq 2$*, and* $X \subseteq \mathcal{G}(X)$ *for any* $X \in \{\Gamma^x : x \in Ord\}$*.*

Furthermore if Γ *enjoys* **(Γ.i)** *for* $3 \leq i \leq 5$*, then* **(θ.i)** *for* $3 \leq i \leq 4$ *holds.*

In general for any persistent operator Γ satisfying **(Γ.2)**, $\mathcal{W} \subseteq \Gamma(\mathcal{W})$ holds.

Lemma 3.26 *If* Γ *is persistent and enjoys* **(Γ.2)***, then* $\mathcal{W} \subseteq \Gamma(\mathcal{W})$*.*

4 Π_N-reflection

In this section we introduce a recursive notation system $Od(\Pi_N)$ of ordinals for each positive integer $N \geq 4$, which we studied first in [1].

Let KPΠ_N denote the set theory for Π_N-reflecting universes. KPΠ_N is obtained from the Kripke-Platek set theory with the Axiom of Infinity by adding the axiom: for any Π_N formula $A(u)$, $A(u) \to \exists z(u \in z \,\&\, A^z(u))$, where A^z denotes the result of restricting any unbounded quantifiers $Qx\,(Q \in \{\exists, \forall\})$ in A to $Qx \in z$.

We show that for each $\alpha < \Omega$ in $Od(\Pi_N)$, both KPΠ_N and Π_{N-1}-Fix prove that the initial segment of $Od(\Pi_N)$ determined by α is a well ordering, where Ω denotes the first recursively regular ordinal ω_1^{CK} and π the first Π_N-reflecting ordinal. Each $\alpha \in Od(\Pi_N)$ is less than the next epsilon number $\varepsilon_{\pi+1}$ to π.

4.1 Prelude

The main constructor in $Od(\Pi_N)$ is to form an o.d. $d_\sigma^q\alpha < \sigma$ from a symbol d and o.d.'s σ, q, α, where σ denotes a recursively regular ordinal and q a finite sequence of quadruples of o.d.'s. By definition we set $d_\sigma^q\alpha < \sigma$. Let $\gamma \prec_2 \sigma :\Leftrightarrow \gamma \prec \sigma$, and $\preceq_2$ its reflexive closure. Then the set $\{\tau : \sigma \prec_2 \tau\}$ is finite and linearly ordered by $\prec_2$ for each σ, namely $\{\sigma : \sigma \preceq_2 \pi\}$ is a tree with the root π. In the diagram $d_\sigma^q\alpha$ q includes some data telling us how the diagram $d_\sigma^q\alpha$ is constructed from its *predecessors* $\{\tau : d_\sigma^q\alpha \prec_2 \tau\} = \{\tau : \sigma \preceq_2 \tau\}$. Here involves subtle and complicated requirements to which $d_\sigma^q\alpha$ have to obey, cf. Definition 4.14. These were obtained solely from finitary analysis of finite proof figures for Π_N-reflection, cf. [7]: its generation has not referred to any set-theoretic considerations. Despite the lack of meaning it now turns out that our wellfoundedness proof of $Od(\Pi_N)$ in [4] and in Section 6, which is formalizable in $\mathrm{KP}\Pi_N$, suggests a set-theoretic interpretation. Let us explain this.

In a wellfoundedness proof for $Od(\Pi_N)$ using the maximal distinguished class $\mathcal{W}_D$ introduced in [9], the main task is to show the tree $\{\sigma : \sigma \preceq_2 \pi\}$ to be wellfounded. When we assume the existence of a Σ^1_2-class, i.e., $\mathcal{W}_D$ as a *set*, then we [1] can show that $Od(\Pi_N)$ is wellfounded. Nevertheless $\mathcal{W}_D$ is a proper *class* in $\mathrm{KP}\Pi_N$. Therefore we have to show for each o.d. η there exists a *set*, say P, in which we can imitate constructions in [1] up to the given η. Namely the maximal distinguished class defined *on* P denoted $\mathcal{W}^P$ has to enjoy the same closure properties as $\mathcal{W}_D$ up to η. Such a set P is said to be η-*Mahlo*. Then the existence of η-Mahlo sets guarantees the wellfoundedness of the chain $\{\tau : \tau \preceq_2 \eta\}$ with respect to $\prec_2$. Thus a crux in showing $Od(\Pi_N)$ to be wellfounded without assuming the existence of a Σ^1_2-class $\mathcal{W}_D$ is to show the existence of η-Mahlo sets for each η. We have learnt in [3] that if a set is Π_2-reflecting on γ-Mahlo universes for any $\gamma \prec_2 \eta$, then the set is η-Mahlo.

Let L denote a Π_N-refecting universe: $(\mathrm{L}; \in) \models \mathrm{KP}\Pi_N$. Transitive sets in $\mathrm{L} \cup \{\mathrm{L}\}$ are denoted $P, Q, \ldots$, and L^t denotes the set of transitive sets in L. For a transitive set P let $ord(P)$ denote the set of ordinals in P. Also let $ord(P)^+$ denote the supremum of Δ_1-wellfounded relations on P. A class $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathrm{L}^t \cup \{\mathrm{L}\}$ is said to be a Π_i-*class* if there exists a set-theoretic Π_i-formula F such that for any $P \in \mathrm{L}^t \cup \{\mathrm{L}\}$, $P \in \mathcal{X} \Leftrightarrow P \models F :\Leftrightarrow (P; \in) \models F$. By a Π^1_0-*class* we mean a Π_i-class for some $i \geq 2$. A sequence $\{\mathcal{X}_\xi\}_{\xi<\alpha}$ ($\mathcal{X}_\xi \subseteq \mathrm{L}^t \cup \{\mathrm{L}\}$) is said to be a Π_i-*sequence* if classes $\mathcal{X}_\xi$ are Π_i-classes uniformly, i.e., there exists a set-theoretic Π_i-formula $F(\xi)$ such that for any $P \in \mathrm{L}^t \cup \{\mathrm{L}\}$ and any $\xi < \min\{\alpha, ord(P)^+\}$, $P \in \mathcal{X}_\xi \Leftrightarrow P \models F(\xi)$. By a Π^1_0-*sequence* we mean a Π_i-sequence for some $i \geq 2$.

A Π_i-recursively Mahlo operation is defined through a universal Π_i-formula $\Pi_i(a)$, cf. [11] as follows

$$P \in M_i(\mathcal{X}) :\Leftrightarrow \forall b \in P[P \models \Pi_i(b) \to \exists Q \in \mathcal{X} \cap P(Q \models \Pi_i(b))].$$

We consider two kinds of its iterations, both are defined by transfinite recursion on ordinals β (or, in general, along a well founded relation), and their mixture. First an inner iteration is defined from a sequence $\{\mathcal{X}_\xi\}_{\xi<\alpha}$: let

$$M^\beta_{1,i}(\{\mathcal{X}_\xi\}_{\xi<\alpha}) := \bigcap\{M_i(M_i(M^\nu_{1,i}(\{\mathcal{X}_\xi\}_{\xi<\alpha})\cap\mathcal{X}_\xi)\cap\mathcal{X}_\delta) : \delta\leq\xi<\alpha, \nu<\beta\}.$$

Second an outer iterartion is defined from a class $\mathcal{X}$:

$$M^\beta_{2,i}(\mathcal{X}) := \mathcal{X}\cap\bigcap\{M_i(M^\nu_{2,i}(\mathcal{X})) : \nu<\beta\}.$$

For the case $\mathcal{X}=\mathrm{L}^t\cup\{\mathrm{L}\}$ put

$$M^\beta_i(\mathrm{L}) := M^\beta_{2,i}(\mathrm{L}^t\cup\{\mathrm{L}\}) = \bigcap\{M_i(M^\nu_i(\mathrm{L})) : \nu<\beta\}.$$

Finally their mixture is defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}&M^\beta_i(\mathcal{X};\{\mathcal{X}_\xi\}_{\xi<\alpha}) :=\\ &\mathcal{X}\cap\bigcap\{M_i(M_i(M^\nu_i(\mathcal{X};\{\mathcal{X}_\xi\}_{\xi<\alpha})\cap\mathcal{X}_\xi)\cap\mathcal{X}_\delta) : \delta\leq\xi<\alpha,\nu<\beta\}.\end{aligned}$$

Obviously $M^\beta_i(\mathrm{L}^t\cup\{\mathrm{L}\};\{\mathcal{X}_\xi\}_{\xi<\alpha}) = M^\beta_{1,i}(\{\mathcal{X}_\xi\}_{\xi<\alpha})$.

Observe that $M_i(\mathcal{X})$ is a Π_{i+1}-class if $\mathcal{X}$ is a Π^1_0-class. $\{M^\nu_{1,i}(\{\mathcal{X}_\xi\}_{\xi<\alpha})\}_{\nu<\beta}$ is a Π_{i+1}-sequence for any Π^1_0-sequence $\{\mathcal{X}_\xi\}_{\xi<\alpha}$, and $\{M^\nu_{2,i}(\mathcal{X}) : \nu<\beta\}$ is a Π_{i+1}-sequence for any Π_{i+1}-class $\mathcal{X}$. Finally $\{M^\nu_i(\mathcal{X};\{\mathcal{X}_\xi\}_{\xi<\alpha})\}_{\nu<\beta}$ is a Π_{i+1}-sequence for any Π^1_0-sequence $\{\mathcal{X}_\xi\}_{\xi<\alpha}$ and any Π_{i+1}-class $\mathcal{X}$.

Therefore for any Π_{i+1}-class $\mathcal{X}$ and any Π_{i+1}-sequence $\{\mathcal{X}_\xi\}_{\xi<\alpha}$

$$\begin{aligned}&P\in\mathcal{X}\cap\bigcap\{M_{i+1}(\mathcal{X}_\xi) : \xi<\alpha\}\Rightarrow\\ &P\in M^\beta_i(\mathcal{X};\{\mathcal{X}_\xi\}_{\xi<\alpha})\cap\bigcap\{M_i(M^\beta_i(\mathcal{X};\{\mathcal{X}_\xi\}_{\xi<\alpha})\cap\mathcal{X}_\xi) : \xi<\alpha\}\end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

for any 'ordinal' $\beta<ord(P)^+$. This is seen by induction on β using the following fact:

$$\text{For a } \Pi^1_0\text{-class } \mathcal{X} \text{ and a } \Pi_i\text{-class } \mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{Y}\cap M_i(\mathcal{X})\subseteq M_i(\mathcal{Y}\cap\mathcal{X}) \quad (4)$$

In general β can be replaced by a Δ_1-definable well founded relation on each P. For example $\mathrm{L}_\kappa\in M_{i+1}(\mathrm{L}^t)\Rightarrow\mathrm{L}_\kappa\in M^{<\kappa^+}_i(\mathrm{L}) = \bigcap\{M^\beta_i(\mathrm{L}) : \beta<\kappa^+\}$ for the next admissible κ^+ to κ.

Let $\mathcal{X}\prec_i\mathcal{Y}$ denote

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{X}\prec_i\mathcal{Y} \quad &:\Leftrightarrow\quad \mathcal{Y}\subseteq M_i(\mathcal{X}), \text{ i.e., } \forall P\in\mathcal{Y}(P\in M_i(\mathcal{X})),\\ \text{and } \mathcal{X}\preceq_i\mathcal{Y} \quad &:\Leftrightarrow\quad \mathcal{X}=\mathcal{Y} \text{ or } \mathcal{X}\prec_i\mathcal{Y}.\end{aligned}$$

For example (3) is written as $M^\nu_i(\mathcal{X};\{\mathcal{X}_\xi\}_{\xi<\alpha})\cap\mathcal{X}_\xi\prec_i M^\beta_i(\mathcal{X};\{\mathcal{X}_\xi\}_{\xi<\alpha})\prec_i \mathcal{X}\cap\bigcap\{M_{i+1}(\mathcal{X}_\xi) : \xi<\alpha\}$ for $\nu<\beta$ and $\xi<\alpha$, and (4) is as $\mathcal{Y}\cap\mathcal{X}\prec_i\mathcal{Y}\cap M_i(\mathcal{X})$. Observe that the relation $\prec_i$ is transitive and wellfounded since the $\in$-relation is wellfounded, and $\prec_{i+1}\subseteq\prec_i$.

Π_3-reflecting universes L are so simple to analyse: L can be resolved or approximated by $M^\alpha_2(\mathrm{L})$, cf. [3]. Nevertheless Π_N-reflecting universes L for $N\geq 4$ involves a complicated ramification process to resolve by using iterations of Π_2-recursively Mahlo operations $M_2^\alpha(\mathrm{L})$. Such a resolving is needed to define η-Mahloness. In fact the following ramification is inspired from a finer analysis of o.d.'s, which has been constructed purely from combinatorial considerations. Since the resolving of Π_N-reflecting universes L by iterations of Π_2-recursively Mahlo operations is so complicated, we first explain the simplest case. Namely Π_3-reflection on Π_3-reflecting ordinals.

4.2 Π_3-reflection on Π_3-reflecting ordinals

4.2.1 Mahlo classes for M_3^2

Let $M_3^2 = M_3(M_3)$ denote the class of Π_3-reflecting universes on Π_3-reflecting universes M_3. And let $\mathrm{L} \in M_3^2$.

Define Mahlo classes $M_2(2;\beta), M_2((2,1);(\beta,\beta_0))$ on $\mathrm{L}^t \cup \{\mathrm{L}\}$ as follows. Let $\pi := ord(\mathrm{L})$.

$$\begin{aligned} M_2(2;\beta) &= \bigcap\{M_2(M_2(2;\nu)\cap M_3) : \nu < \beta\} \\ M_2((2,1);(\beta,\beta_0)) &= M_2(2;\beta)\cap\bigcap\{M_2(M_2((2,1);(\beta,\nu))) : \nu < \beta_0\} \end{aligned}$$

and let

$$\mathcal{T} = \{M_2(2;\beta)\cap M_3, M_2((2,1);(\beta,\beta_0)) : \beta < \varepsilon_{\pi+1}, \beta_0 < \pi\}.$$

Note that $M_3 = M_2(2;0)\cap M_3$ and $M_2^\beta(\mathrm{L}) = M_2(2,1);(0,\beta))$. For $\mathcal{X} \in \mathcal{T}$ define a pair $h(\mathcal{X}) = \langle h_0(\mathcal{X}), h_1(\mathcal{X})\rangle$ by

$$h(M_2(2;\beta)\cap M_3) := \langle\beta,\pi\rangle \text{ and } h(M_2((2,1);(\beta,\beta_0)) := \langle\beta,\beta_0\rangle \tag{5}$$

Then $h(\mathcal{X}) <_{lex} h(\mathcal{Y}) \Rightarrow \mathcal{X} \prec_2 \mathcal{Y}$ for $\mathcal{X},\mathcal{Y} \in \mathcal{T}$. Namely we see the following facts as in Section 4.1:

$$\nu < \beta_0 \Rightarrow M_2((2,1);(\beta,\nu)) \prec_2 M_2((2,1);(\beta,\beta_0)) \tag{6}$$

$$\nu < \beta \Rightarrow M_2(2;\nu)\cap M_3 \prec_2 M_2(2;\beta) \tag{7}$$

$$M_2((2,1);(\beta,\gamma)) \prec_2 M_2(2;\beta)\cap M_3 \tag{8}$$

$$\nu < \beta \Rightarrow M_2(2;\nu)\cap M_3 \prec_2 M_2((2,1);(\beta,\beta_0)) \tag{9}$$

$$\forall\mathcal{X}\in\mathcal{T}[\mathcal{X} \prec_2 M_3^2]$$

4.2.2 Ordinal diagrams $Od(M_3^2)$ for M_3^2

We define the subsystem $Od(M_3^2) \subset Od$ of ordinal diagrams.

For $\rho \in \mathcal{D}_\sigma^Q \cap Od(M_3^2)$, $Q(\rho)$ is a pair $(rg_2(\rho), st_2(\rho))$ of o.d.'s. Namely $Q(\rho) = (2, rg_2(\rho), \sigma, st_2(\rho))$. Let $\alpha \prec_2 \beta :\Leftrightarrow \alpha \prec \beta$.

Definition 4.1 $Od(M_3^2)$.
The system $Od(M_3^2)$ of o.d.'s is obtained from Od by restricting the construction $(\sigma, q, \alpha) \mapsto d_\sigma^q\alpha$ in Definition 2.1.3 as follows: first set $\pi^+ := \varepsilon_{\pi+1} := \infty$ and

$$M_3 := \{\pi\}\cup\{\alpha \in \mathcal{D}^Q\cap Od(M_3^2) : rg_2(\alpha) = \pi\}.$$

Assume $\alpha \in Od(M_3^2)\,\&\,\sigma \in \{\pi\}\cup\mathcal{D}^Q\,\&\,q = (\kappa,\nu) \subseteq Od(M_3^2)$ such that

1.

$$\sigma \preceq \kappa \in M_3 \tag{10}$$

2.

$$\sigma = \pi \Rightarrow \nu \leq \alpha \tag{11}$$

and

$$\nu < \kappa^+ \tag{12}$$

Put $\rho := d_\sigma^q \alpha \in \mathcal{D}_\sigma^Q \subseteq Od$. For this ρ define

$$pd_2(\rho) = \sigma,\ st_2(\rho) = \nu,\ rg_2(\rho) = \kappa.$$

Then $\rho \in Od(M_3^2)$ if the following conditions are fulfilled besides (1) in Definition 2.1.3:

Case1 $\rho \in M_3$, i.e., $\kappa = rg_2(\rho) = \pi$: Then

$$\forall \eta \in M_3 | \pi[\rho \prec \eta \Rightarrow st_2(\rho) < st_2(\eta)].$$

Case2 $\rho \notin M_3$, i.e., $\kappa = rg_2(\rho) < \pi$: Then

$$rg_2(\rho) = \min\{\kappa < \pi : \rho \prec \kappa \in M_3\}$$

i.e., $\forall \tau[\rho \prec \tau \prec \kappa \Rightarrow rg_2(\tau) = \kappa]$ and

$$\forall \tau[\rho \prec \tau \prec \kappa \Rightarrow st_2(\rho) < st_2(\tau)].$$

($\mathcal{D}$.2)

$$\forall \tau \leq rg_2(\rho)(K_\tau st_2(\rho) < \rho) \tag{13}$$

Now for each o.d. $\rho \in \mathcal{D}^Q \cap Od(M_3^2)$ we associate a Mahlo class $\mathcal{X}(\rho) \in \mathcal{T}$ and a pair $h(\rho)$, cf. (5) as follows:

Case1 $\rho \in M_3$: $\mathcal{X}(\rho) = M_2(2;\beta) \cap M_3$ for $\beta = st_2(\rho)$, and $h(\rho) := h(\mathcal{X}(\rho)) = \langle \beta, \pi \rangle$.

Case2 $\rho \notin M_3$: $\mathcal{X}(\rho) = M_2((2,1);(\beta,\gamma))$ for $\gamma = st_2(\rho)$ and $\beta = st_2(rg_2(\rho))$, and $h(\rho) := h(\mathcal{X}(\rho)) = \langle \beta, \gamma \rangle$.

Then we see

Lemma 4.2 *If $\delta \prec_2 \eta$, then $h(\delta) <_{lex} h(\eta)$ and hence $\mathcal{X}(\delta) \prec_2 \mathcal{X}(\eta)$.*

Proof. Suppose $\eta = pd_2(\delta)$.

(8) corresponds to the case: $rg_2(\delta) = \eta \in M_3$ with $st_2(\eta) = \beta$, $st_2(\delta) = \gamma < \eta^+$.

(6) corresponds to the case: $rg_2(\delta) = rg_2(\eta) < \pi$ with $\nu = st_2(\delta) < st_2(\eta) = \beta_0$.

(7) corresponds to the case: $\delta, \eta \in M_3$ and $\nu = st_2(\delta) < st_2(\eta) = \beta$.

Finally consider the case when $\delta \in M_3$ and $\eta \notin M_3$. Then $rg_2(\eta) = \min\{\sigma : \delta \prec \sigma \in M_3\}$. (9) corresponds to this case with $\nu = st_2(\delta) < st_2(rg_2(\eta)) = \beta$ (and $st_2(\eta) = \beta_0$). □

We could prove the wellfoundedness of $Od(M_3^2)|\Omega$ using Lemma 4.2 and distinguished classes as in Section 6.

4.2.3 Wellfoundedness proof for $Od(M_3^2)$

We show the

Theorem 4.3 *For each* $\alpha < d_\Omega \varepsilon_{\pi+1}$*,i.e., each* $\alpha \in Od(M_3^2)|\Omega$*,* $[\Pi_2^0, \Pi_2^0]$-Fix *proves that* $(Od(M_3^2)|\alpha, <)$ *is a well ordering.*

Work in $[\Pi_2^0, \Pi_2^0]$-Fix.

Definition 4.4

$$\alpha \lhd \beta :\Leftrightarrow \alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{D}^Q \,\&\, \alpha \prec \beta \prec rg_2(\alpha).$$

Observe that for $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{D}^Q$ with $\alpha \prec \beta$, $\alpha \lhd \beta$ iff $\alpha \in M_3$ or $rg_2(\alpha) = rg_2(\beta)$. Hence $\alpha \lhd \beta \Rightarrow h(\alpha) <_{lex} h(\beta)$. Specifically supposing $\gamma \prec \alpha$ we see:

1. $\alpha \notin M_3$: Then $\gamma \lhd \alpha$ iff $\gamma \notin M_3 \,\&\, rg_2(\gamma) = rg_2(\alpha)$(, and hence $h_0(\gamma) = h_0(\alpha)$) $\&\, h_1(\gamma) = st_2(\gamma) < st_2(\alpha) = h_1(\alpha)$, cf. (6), or $\gamma \in M_3 \,\&\, h_0(\gamma) = st_2(\gamma) < st_2(rg_2(\alpha)) = h_0(\alpha)$, cf. (9).
2. $\alpha \in M_3$: Then $\gamma \lhd \alpha$ iff $\gamma \in M_3 \,\&\, h_0(\gamma) = st_2(\gamma) < st_2(\alpha) = h_0(\alpha)$, cf. (7).

Moreover if $M_3 \not\ni \gamma \prec \alpha \in M_3$, then $rg_2(\gamma) \preceq \alpha$ and $h_0(\gamma) = st_2(rg_2(\gamma)) \leq st_2(\alpha) = h_0(\alpha) \,\&\, h_1(\gamma) = st_2(\gamma) < \pi = h_1(\alpha)$, cf. (8).

Definition 4.5

$$\alpha \in V(X) :\Leftrightarrow \forall \gamma \lhd \alpha [\gamma \in \mathcal{G}(X) \to \gamma \in X].$$

Now let us define an operator Γ_{32} on $Od(M_3^2)$ from $V(X)$.

Definition 4.6 *1.* $\alpha \in \Gamma_{30}(X)$ iff $\pi > \alpha \notin M_3$, $\alpha \in \mathcal{G}(X) \cap V(X)$ and $[\alpha \in SR \Rightarrow \forall \gamma \in \mathcal{D}_\alpha (\gamma \in \mathcal{G}(X) \to \gamma \in X)]$.

2. $\alpha \in \Gamma_{32}(X)$ iff

$$\alpha \in \Gamma_{30}(X) \vee [\Gamma_{30}(X) \subseteq X \,\&\, \alpha \in M_3|\pi \,\&\, \alpha \in \mathcal{G}(X) \cap V(X)].$$

Let us examine the complexity of these operators. Both V and Γ_{30} are Π_2^0, and hence Γ_{32} is $[\Pi_2^0, \Pi_2^0]$.

We write Γ for Γ_{32}, $|\alpha|$ for $|n|_{\Gamma_{32}}$.

We see easily that $\Gamma = \Gamma_{32}$ enjoys the hypotheses **(Γ.0)**, **(Γ.1)** and **(Γ.5)** in Subsection 3.3. Furthermore **(Γ.3)** and **(Γ.4)** follow from the facts: if $\alpha \notin R'$ or $\alpha \in SR$, then $\alpha \in V(X)$ for any X.

We next show that Γ enjoys the hypothesis **(Γ.2)**.

Theorem 4.7 *Assume* $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{W}$*. Then*

$$\alpha < \beta \Rightarrow x = |\alpha| < |\beta| = y.$$

Proof of Theorem 4.7 for $\Gamma = \Gamma_{32}$. Assume $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{W}$ and $\alpha < \beta$. Put $x = |\alpha|, y = |\beta|$. We show $x < y$ by induction on the natural sum $x\#y$. Suppose $x \geq y$. Put $X = \Gamma^x, Y = \Gamma^y$. We show $\alpha \in Y$. As in [8] we see, using IH, $\alpha \in \mathcal{G}(X)|\beta = \mathcal{G}(Y)|\beta \,\&\, \alpha \in V(Y)$, and we can assume $\alpha \prec \beta \in \mathcal{D}^Q$ and $\alpha \not\leq Y$ by IH. There are two cases to consider.
Csae1 $\exists\sigma[\alpha \preceq \sigma \,\&\, \sigma \lhd \beta]$: Then by Lemma 3.16 and $\alpha \not\leq Y$ we have $\sigma \in \mathcal{G}(Y)$. $\beta \in V(Y)$ yields $\alpha \leq \sigma \in Y$.
Case2 Otherwise : We have $\sigma \ntriangleleft \beta$ for any σ with $\alpha \preceq \sigma \prec \beta$, and $rg_2(\alpha) \preceq \beta \,\&\, \alpha \notin M_3$. We claim $M_3 \ni rg_2(\alpha) = \beta$. Otherwise we would have $rg_2(\alpha) \lhd \beta$. Thus $\beta \in M_3$, and hence $\alpha \in \Gamma_{30}(Y) \subseteq Y$. □

Let $V := V(\mathcal{W})$.

Lemma 4.8

$$\alpha \in \mathcal{G} \cap V \Rightarrow \alpha \in \mathcal{W}.$$

The following lemma is seen from Lemma 3.11 and (13).

Lemma 4.9 *If* $\rho \in \mathcal{G} \cap \mathcal{D}^Q$ *and* $\kappa := rg_2(\rho)$*, then* $st_2(\rho) \in \mathcal{C}^\kappa(\mathcal{W})$*.*
In particular, $\rho \in \mathcal{G} \cap \mathcal{D}^Q \cap M_3 \Rightarrow st_2(\rho) \in \mathcal{C}^\pi(\mathcal{W}) = \mathcal{W}_\pi$*.*

Lemma 4.10 *For* $\rho \in \mathcal{D}^Q \cap Od(M_3^2)$*,* $Q(\rho) = \{st_2(\rho), rg_2(\rho)\} \leq \max\{b(\rho), \pi\}$*.*

Proof. First off, $rg_2(\rho) \leq \pi$. It remains to show $st_2(\rho) \leq \max\{b(\rho), \pi\}$. By (11) and (12) we can assume $\rho \in M_3 \,\&\, pd_2(\rho) < \pi$. Let α_1 denote the diagram such that $\rho \prec \alpha_1 \in \mathcal{D}_\pi$. Then $\alpha_1 \in M_3$ and $st_2(\rho) < st_2(\alpha_1) \leq b(\alpha_1) < b(\rho)$ by Lemma 2.4. □

Lemma 4.11 *(cf. Definition 3.21.1.) For each* $n \in \omega$

$$\forall\alpha \in \mathcal{W}_\pi|\omega_n(\pi + 1)\forall q \subseteq \mathcal{W}_\pi|\omega_n(\pi + 1)A(\alpha, q).$$

Proof. We have to show for each $n \in \omega$

$$\forall\alpha \in \mathcal{W}_\pi|\omega_n(\pi + 1)\forall q \subseteq \mathcal{W}_\pi|\omega_n(\pi + 1)A(\alpha, q).$$

By main induction on $\alpha \in \mathcal{W}_\pi|\omega_n(\pi + 1)$ with subsidiary induction on $q \subseteq \mathcal{W}_\pi|\omega_n(\pi + 1)$. Here observe that if $\beta_1 \in \mathcal{D}$ with $b(\beta_1) < \omega_n(\pi + 1)$, then by Lemma 4.10 we have $Q(\beta_1) \leq \max\{b(\beta_1), \pi\} < \omega_n(\pi + 1)$.

Let $\alpha_1 \in \mathcal{D}_\sigma|\pi$ with $\sigma \in \mathcal{W}_\pi$ and $\alpha = b(\alpha_1) \,\&\, q = Q(\alpha_1)$. By Theorem 3.23 we have $\alpha_1 \in \mathcal{G}$. We show $\alpha_1 \in \mathcal{W}$. By Lemma 4.8 it suffices to show $\alpha_1 \in V$. By $\sigma \in \mathcal{W}_\pi$ we have $\sigma \in V \cup \{\pi\}$. If $\sigma = \pi$, i.e., $pd_2(\alpha_1) = \pi$, then $\alpha_1 \in M_3 \,\&\, st_2(\alpha_1) \in \mathcal{W}_\pi$ by Lemma 4.9, and we see $\alpha_1 \in V$ from $\mathcal{G} \ni \gamma \lhd \alpha_1 \Rightarrow \mathcal{W}_\pi \ni st_2(\gamma) < st_2(\alpha_1)$. Therefore we can assume $\sigma \in V$. If $\sigma \prec rg_2(\alpha_1)$, then $\alpha_1 \lhd \sigma \in V$, and hence $\alpha_1 \in \mathcal{W}$. Assume $rg_2(\alpha_1) = \sigma$.

Let $\mathcal{G} \ni \gamma \lhd \alpha_1$. We have to show $\gamma \in \mathcal{W}$. We can assume $rg_2(\gamma) = \sigma$ by $\sigma \in V$. Thus $st_2(\gamma) < st_2(\alpha)$. By Lemma 4.9 we have $st_2(\gamma), st_2(\alpha) \in \mathcal{C}^\sigma(\mathcal{W})$. We have $\mathcal{B}_{>\sigma}(st_2(\gamma)) < b(\alpha_1) = \alpha$, cf. Lemma 4.18.6. Lemma 3.22 with MIH(α) yields $st_2(\gamma) \in \mathcal{W}_\pi$. Therefore $\gamma \in \mathcal{W}$ is seen by induction on $st_2(\gamma)$.

We are done. □

Lemma 4.11 yields Lemma 4.12: $\alpha_1 \in \mathcal{W}_\pi$ for each $\alpha_1 \in Od(M_3^2)$ as in [8].

Lemma 4.12 *For each* α_1, $\alpha_1 \in \mathcal{W}_\pi$.

Consequently Lemma 3.18 yields Theorem 4.3.

4.3 Mahlo classes for Π_N-reflection

In what follows N denotes a fixed integer $N \geq 4$. Let us resolve a Π_N-reflecting universe L. Now let $M_i(\alpha;\beta)\,(i \geq 2)$ denote the following class:

$$M_i(\alpha;\beta) := M^{\beta}_{1,i}(\{\mathcal{X}_\xi\}_{\xi<\alpha}) \text{ with the } \Pi_{i+2}\text{-class } \mathcal{X}_\xi = M^{\xi}_{i+1}(\mathrm{L}).$$

Namely

$$M_i(\alpha;\beta) = \bigcap\{M_i(M_i(M_i(\alpha;\nu) \cap M^{\xi}_{i+1}(L)) \cap M^{\delta}_{i+1}(L)) : \delta \leq \xi < \alpha, \nu < \beta\}$$

Then $M_i(\alpha;\beta)$ is again a Π_{i+1}-class and hence from (3)

$$M_i(\alpha;\beta) \prec_i M^{\alpha}_{i+1}(\mathrm{L})\,(\alpha > 0)\,\&\, M_i(\alpha;\beta) \supset M^{\alpha}_{i+1}(\mathrm{L}).$$

Moreover let $\bar{\alpha} = (\alpha_n > \cdots > \alpha_1)\,(n \geq 0)$ denote a decreasing sequence of ordinals and $\bar{\beta} = (\beta_n, \ldots, \beta_1)$ a sequence of ordinals of the same length. By induction on the length n of the sequences $\bar{\alpha}, \bar{\beta}$ we define classes $M_i(\bar{\alpha};\bar{\beta})$ as follows. $M_i(\langle\rangle;\langle\rangle) = \mathrm{L}^t \cup \{\mathrm{L}\}$ for the empty sequence $\langle\rangle$. Let $\bar{\alpha} * (\alpha) = (\alpha_n > \cdots > \alpha_1 > \alpha)$ and $\bar{\beta} * (\beta) = (\beta_n, \ldots, \beta_1, \beta)$ denote the concatenated sequences for ordinals α, β with $\alpha < \alpha_1$. Then define

$$M_i(\bar{\alpha} * (\alpha); \bar{\beta} * (\beta)) = M^{\beta}_i(\mathcal{Y}; \{\mathcal{X}_\xi\}_{\xi<\alpha})$$

with the Π_{i+2}-class $\mathcal{X}_\xi = M^{\xi}_{i+1}(L)$ and $\mathcal{Y} = M_i(\bar{\alpha};\bar{\beta})$.

Then as above we see that $M_i(\bar{\alpha};\bar{\beta})$ are Π_{i+1}-classes and

$$\begin{aligned}&M_i(\bar{\alpha} * (\alpha); \bar{\beta} * (\beta)) = M_i(\bar{\alpha};\bar{\beta}) \cap \\ &\bigcap\{M_i(M_i(M_i(\bar{\alpha} * (\alpha); \bar{\beta} * (\nu)) \cap M^{\xi}_{i+1}(L)) \cap M^{\delta}_{i+1}(L)) : \\ &\delta \leq \xi < \alpha, \nu < \beta\}\end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

Thus for any $\bar{\alpha} = (\alpha_n > \cdots > \alpha_1)$, $\alpha < \alpha_0 < \alpha_1$ and any ordinals $\bar{\beta}, \beta_0$, we see from (3)

$$M_i(\bar{\alpha};\bar{\beta}) \cap M^{\alpha}_{i+1}(\mathrm{L}) \prec_i M^{\alpha_n}_{i+1}(\mathrm{L})\,(n > 0) \tag{15}$$

and

$$M_i(\bar{\alpha} * (\alpha_0); \bar{\beta} * (\beta_0)) \cap M^{\alpha}_{i+1}(\mathrm{L}) \prec_i M_i(\bar{\alpha};\bar{\beta}) \cap M^{\alpha_0}_{i+1}(\mathrm{L}) \tag{16}$$

Now let us depict this ramification process as wellfounded trees $\mathcal{T}^i_N\,(2 \leq i < N)$. These trees are defined by induction on $N - i$. Each class in $\mathcal{T}^i_N$ is a Π_N-class for any i. Pick a Δ_1-well ordering $<$ on L. Assume its order type is, for example, $\varepsilon_{\pi+1}$ for the least ordinal π not in L. For a Π_N-reflecting universe L, the singleton class $\{\mathrm{L}\}$ sits on each root of $\mathcal{T}^i_N$. In the tree $\mathcal{T}^{N-1}_N$ its sons are Π_N-classes $M^{\alpha}_{N-1}(\mathrm{L})$ for each 'ordinal' $\alpha < \varepsilon_{\pi+1}$ such that $M^{\alpha}_{N-1}(\mathrm{L}) \prec_{N-1} M_N(\mathrm{L}) \ni \mathrm{L}$. Further the node $M^{\alpha}_{N-1}(\mathrm{L})$ has sons $M^{\beta}_{N-1}(\mathrm{L})$ for $\beta < \alpha$. Each node $M^{\alpha}_{N-1}(\mathrm{L})$ can be identified with the ordinal $\alpha < \varepsilon_{\pi+1}$, and the relation $M^{\beta}_{N-1}(\mathrm{L}) \prec_{N-1} M^{\alpha}_{N-1}(\mathrm{L})$ on $\mathcal{T}^{N-1}_N$ with $\beta < \alpha$. Note that these are Δ_1-relations on L.

Suppose a wellfounded tree $\mathcal{T}^{i+1}_N$ has been constructed for $2 \leq i < N-1$ so that each class in $\mathcal{T}^{i+1}_N$ is a Π_N-class, and if a class $\mathcal{X}$ is a son of a class $\mathcal{Y}$, then $\mathcal{X} \prec_{i+1} \mathcal{Y}$, i.e., the tree ordering is compatible with the relation $\prec_{i+1}$. Classes in the tree $\mathcal{T}^{i+1}_N$ are assumed to be ordered by the relation $\prec_{i+1}$. Moreover suppose that the tree $\mathcal{T}^{i+1}_N$ and the relation $\prec_{i+1}$ on $\mathcal{T}^{i+1}_N$ are coded by Δ_1-relations on L (*Coding Supposition*). Then another wellfounded tree $\mathcal{T}^{i}_N$ is defined as follows.

For a branch $\bar{\mathcal{X}} * (\mathcal{X}_1) = (\mathcal{X}_n, \ldots, \mathcal{X}_2, \mathcal{X}_1)$ with $\mathcal{X}_1 \prec_{i+1} \mathcal{X}_2 \prec_{i+1} \cdots \prec_{i+1} \mathcal{X}_n \prec_{i+1} \mathrm{L} \,\&\, \mathcal{X}_m \in \mathcal{T}^{i+1}_N \,(n \geq 1)$ in the tree $\mathcal{T}^{i+1}_N$ and a sequence $\bar{\beta} * (\beta_1) = (\beta_n, \ldots, \beta_1)$ of ordinals, a class $M_i(\bar{\mathcal{X}}; \bar{\beta})$ is defined by replacing $\xi < \alpha$ in the definition (14) of $M_i(\bar{\alpha}; \bar{\beta})$ by the wellfounded relation $\prec_{i+1}$ in $\mathcal{T}^{i+1}_N$:

$$\begin{aligned} & M_i(\bar{\mathcal{X}} * (\mathcal{X}_1); \bar{\beta} * (\beta_1)) = M_i(\bar{\mathcal{X}}; \bar{\beta}) \cap \\ & \bigcap \{ M_i(M_i(M_i(\bar{\mathcal{X}} * (\mathcal{X}_1); \bar{\beta} * (\nu)) \cap \mathcal{X}_0) \cap \mathcal{X}^0) : \\ & \mathcal{X}^0 \preceq_{i+1} \mathcal{X}_0 \prec_{i+1} \mathcal{X}_1, \mathcal{X}^0, \mathcal{X}_0 \in \mathcal{T}^{i+1}_N, \nu < \beta_1 \} \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

By the *Coding Supposition* $M_i(\bar{\mathcal{X}}; \bar{\beta})$ is a uniform Π_{i+1}-class, and hence as in (15) and (16) we see for $\mathcal{X} \prec_{i+1} \mathcal{X}_0 \prec_{i+1} \mathcal{X}_1 \prec_{i+1} \cdots \prec_{i+1} \mathcal{X}_n \prec_{i+1} \{\mathrm{L}\} \,(n \geq 0)$ in the tree $\mathcal{T}^{i+1}_N$ with $\bar{\mathcal{X}} = (\mathcal{X}_n, \ldots, \mathcal{X}_1)$ and a sequence $\bar{\beta} = (\beta_n, \ldots, \beta_1)$ of ordinals:

$$M_i(\bar{\mathcal{X}}; \bar{\beta}) \cap \mathcal{X}_0 \prec_i \mathcal{X}_n \,(n > 0) \tag{18}$$

and

$$M_i(\bar{\mathcal{X}} * (\mathcal{X}_0); \bar{\beta} * (\beta_0)) \cap \mathcal{X} \prec_i M_i(\bar{\mathcal{X}}; \bar{\beta}) \cap \mathcal{X}_0 \subseteq M_i(\bar{\mathcal{X}} * (\mathcal{X}_0); \bar{\beta} * (\beta_0)) \tag{19}$$

Each class $\mathcal{X}$ in the tree $\mathcal{T}^{i}_N$ except $\{\mathrm{L}\}$ is of the form

$$\mathcal{X} = M_i(M_i(\bar{\mathcal{X}}; \bar{\beta}) \cap \mathcal{X}_0) \cap \mathcal{X}^0 \tag{20}$$

for some branch $\mathcal{X}^0 \preceq_{i+1} \mathcal{X}_0 \prec_{i+1} \mathcal{X}_1 \prec_{i+1} \cdots \prec_{i+1} \mathcal{X}_n \prec_{i+1} \mathrm{L} \,(n \geq 0)$ in the tree $\mathcal{T}^{i+1}_N$ with $\bar{\mathcal{X}} = (\mathcal{X}_n, \ldots, \mathcal{X}_1)$ and a sequence $\bar{\beta} = (\beta_n, \ldots, \beta_1)$ of ordinals. Thus $\mathcal{X}$ is a Π_N-class.

The root L has sons $M_i(\mathcal{X}) \cap \mathcal{X}$ for each son $\mathcal{X}$ of L in the tree $\mathcal{T}^{i+1}_N$, i.e., in (20) $\bar{\mathcal{X}} = \bar{\beta} = \langle\rangle$ and $\mathcal{X}_0 = \mathcal{X}^0 = \mathcal{X}$: $M_i(\mathcal{X}) \cap \mathcal{X} \prec_i \mathrm{L}$, cf. (3).

Now the class $\mathcal{X} \in \mathcal{T}^{i}_N$ defined in (20) has sons of three kinds.

A class of the form

$$\mathcal{Y} = M_i(M_i(\bar{\mathcal{X}}; \bar{\beta}) \cap \mathcal{X}_0) \cap \mathcal{Y}^0 \text{ with } \mathcal{T}^{i+1}_N \ni \mathcal{Y}^0 \prec_{i+1} \mathcal{X}^0$$

is a first son of the father $\mathcal{X}$.

$\mathcal{Y} \prec_i \mathcal{X}$ is seen from (4) and the fact that $M_i(M_i(\bar{\mathcal{X}}; \bar{\beta}) \cap \mathcal{X}_0)$ is a Π_{i+1}-class.

Second a second son is a class

$$\mathcal{Z} = M_i(M_i(\bar{\mathcal{X}} * (\mathcal{X}_0); \bar{\beta} * (\gamma)) \cap \mathcal{Z}_0) \cap \mathcal{Z}_0$$

with an ordinal γ and a class $\mathcal{Z}_0 \prec_{i+1} \mathcal{X}_0$ in $\mathcal{T}_N^{i+1}$.

$\mathcal{Z} \prec_i \mathcal{X}$ is seen from $\mathcal{Z}_0 \prec_{i+1} \mathcal{X}_0$ and (19):
$\mathcal{Z} = M_i(M_i(\bar{\mathcal{X}} * (\mathcal{X}_0); \bar{\beta} * (\gamma)) \cap \mathcal{Z}_0) \cap \mathcal{Z}_0 \prec_i M_i(\bar{\mathcal{X}}; \bar{\beta}) \cap \mathcal{X}_0 \prec_i \mathcal{X}$.

Finally for the case $n > 0$ a third son is a class

$$\mathcal{U} = M_i(M_i(\bar{\mathcal{X}} \uparrow k; \bar{\beta} \uparrow (k+1) * (\gamma)) \cap \mathcal{U}_0) \cap \mathcal{U}_0$$

for a $k\,(1 \leq k \leq n)$, an ordinal $\gamma < \beta_k$ and a class $\mathcal{U}_0 \prec_{i+1} \mathcal{X}_k$ in $\mathcal{T}_N^{i+1}$, where $\bar{\mathcal{X}} \uparrow k = (\mathcal{X}_n, \ldots, \mathcal{X}_k)$ and $\bar{\beta} \uparrow (k+1) * (\gamma) = (\beta_n, \ldots, \beta_{k+1}, \gamma)$.

$\mathcal{U} \prec_i \mathcal{X}$ is seen from $\mathcal{U}_0 \prec_{i+1} \mathcal{X}_k \,\&\, \gamma < \beta_k$ and (17):

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \mathcal{U} & = & M_i(M_i(\bar{\mathcal{X}} \uparrow k; \bar{\beta} \uparrow (k+1) * (\gamma)) \cap \mathcal{U}_0) \cap \mathcal{U}_0 \\ & \prec_i & M_i(\bar{\mathcal{X}} \uparrow k; \bar{\beta} \uparrow (k+1) * (\beta_k)) \supset M_i(\bar{\mathcal{X}}; \bar{\beta}) \prec_i \mathcal{X}. \end{array}$$

Note that we have $\mathcal{U} \prec_i \mathcal{Z} \prec_i \mathcal{Y} \prec_i \mathcal{X}$ for the sons $\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{U}$ of $\mathcal{X}$.

These three kinds of classes are sons of $\mathcal{X}$ and this completes a description of the tree $\mathcal{T}_N^i$. The tree represents a ramification procedure in decomposing a Π_N-reflecting universe L in terms of iterations of Π_i-recursively Mahlo operations.

The class $\mathcal{X} \in \mathcal{T}_N^i$ defined in (20) can be coded by a code $(i; \bar{x}; \bar{\beta}; x_0, x^0)$, where $\bar{x}$ are codes for $\bar{\mathcal{X}}$, and x_0 $[x^0]$ for $\mathcal{X}_0$ [for $\mathcal{X}^0$], resp. By the *Coding Supposition*, 'x is a code for a class $\mathcal{X}$ in $\mathcal{T}_N^{i+1}$' is recursive, and so is the relation $x \prec_{i+1} y :\Leftrightarrow \mathcal{X} \prec_{i+1} \mathcal{Y}\,(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y} \in \mathcal{T}_N^{i+1})$. Therefore the tree $\mathcal{T}_N^i$ and the relation $\prec_i$ on $\mathcal{T}_N^i$ are again coded by Δ_1-relations on L.

In this way we get a wellfounded tree $\mathcal{T}_N = \mathcal{T}_N^2$ ordered by the relation $\prec_2$. For $2 \leq i < N-1$ each class $\mathcal{X} \neq \{\mathrm{L}\}$ in $\mathcal{T}_N^i$ is of the form described in (20) for some branch $\mathcal{X}^0 \preceq_{i+1} \mathcal{X}_0 \prec_{i+1} \mathcal{X}_1 \prec_{i+1} \cdots \prec_{i+1} \mathcal{X}_n \prec_{i+1} \mathrm{L}\,(n \geq 0)$ in the tree $\mathcal{T}_N^{i+1}$ and a sequence $(\beta_n, \ldots, \beta_1)$ of ordinals. Therefore we can associate its *construction tree* with depth $N-i$: $\mathcal{X}$ sits on the root and its sons are $\{(\mathcal{X}_m, \beta_m) : 1 \leq m \leq n\}$ and $\mathcal{X}_0, \mathcal{X}^0$, and each son $\mathcal{X}_m, \mathcal{X}^0$ has sons and so on. Does the construction tree remind you an ordinal structure with addition and exponentiation?

4.4 Mahlo classes of ordinal diagrams

Now let us turn to o.d.'s in $Od(\Pi_N)$ and explain what class in $\mathcal{T}_N$ corresponds to a diagram of the form $\eta = d_\sigma^q \alpha$.

q in $\eta = d_\sigma^q \alpha$ includes some data $st_i(\eta), rg_i(\eta)$ for $2 \leq i < N$. $st_{N-1}(\eta)$ is an o.d. less than $\varepsilon_{\pi+1}$ and $rg_{N-1}(\eta) = \pi$, while $st_i(\eta), rg_i(\eta)$ for $i < N-1$ may be undefined. If these are defined, then $\kappa = rg_i(\eta)$ is an o.d. such that $\eta \prec_i \kappa$, where $\prec_i$ is a transitive closure of the relation on o.d.'s $\{(\eta, \kappa) : \kappa = pd_i(\eta)\}$ such that $\prec_{i+1} \subseteq \prec_i$. Therefore the diagram $pd_i(\eta)$ is a proper subdiagram of η. q also determines the diagrams $pd_i(\eta)$. For any $\eta = d_\sigma^q \alpha$ and any i we have $\eta \prec_i \pi$. $st_i(\eta)$ is an o.d. less than the next admissible κ^+ to $\kappa = rg_i(\eta)$.

Let $M_i^\pi = \{\mathrm{L}\} \in \mathcal{T}_N^i$ for i with $2 \leq i < N$. Now we associate a Π_N-class $M_i^\eta \in \mathcal{T}_N^i$ for each such diagram η and each $i\,(2 \leq i < N)$ so that

$$\gamma \prec_i \eta < \pi \Rightarrow M_i^\gamma \prec_i M_i^\eta \tag{21}$$

in the tree $\mathcal{T}_N^i$. Namely the relation $\prec_i$ on o.d.'s is embedded in the relation $\prec_i$ on the tree $\mathcal{T}_N^i$.

The definition of the class $M_i^\eta \in \mathcal{T}_N^i$ is based on induction on $N-i$. First set $M_{N-1}^\eta = M_{N-1}^\beta(\mathrm{L}) \in \mathcal{T}_N^{N-1}$ with $\beta = st_{N-1}(\eta)$. Then (21) is satisfied since $st_{N-1}(\eta)$ is always defined for diagrams η of the form $d_\sigma^q\alpha < \pi$, and enjoys $\gamma \prec_{N-1} \eta \Rightarrow st_{N-1}(\gamma) < st_{N-1}(\eta)$.

q determines a sequence $\{\eta_i^m : m < lh_i(\eta)\}$ of o.d.'s in $\{\beta < \pi : \eta \preceq \beta\}$ with its length $lh_i(\eta) = n+1 > 0$. The sequence enjoys the following property:

$$\eta \preceq_{i+1} \eta_i^0 \prec_{i+1} \eta_i^1 \prec_{i+1} \cdots \prec_{i+1} \eta_i^n < \pi \tag{22}$$

where $\preceq_i$ denotes the reflexive closure of $\prec_i$.

Moreover $st_i(\eta_i^m), rg_i(\eta_i^m)$ have to be defined for $0 \leq m < n$ so that $rg_i(\eta_i^m) \preceq_{i+1} \eta_i^{m+1}$, and these sequences are defined so that if $\eta = pd_i(\gamma)$, one of the following holds, cf. Lemma 4.24 in Subsection 4.6:

Case1

$$\eta = pd_i(\gamma) = pd_{i+1}(\gamma) \,\&\, lh_i(\gamma) = lh_i(\eta) \,\&\, \forall m < lh_i(\gamma)[\gamma_i^m = \eta_i^m]$$

Case2

$$rg_i(\gamma) = pd_i(\gamma) = \eta \,\&\, \gamma_i^0 = \gamma \,\&\, \forall m < lh_i(\eta) = lh_i(\gamma) - 1[\eta_i^m = \gamma_i^{1+m}]$$

Case3

$$\begin{array}{l} \eta = pd_i(\gamma) \prec_i rg_i(\gamma) \,\&\, \gamma_i^0 = \gamma \,\& \\ \exists m[0 < m \leq lh_i(\eta) - 1 \,\&\, rg_i(\eta_i^{m-1}) = rg_i(\gamma) \,\&\, st_i(\eta_i^{m-1}) > st_i(\gamma) \,\& \\ \forall k < lh_i(\eta) - m + 1 = lh_i(\gamma)(k > 0 \to \eta_i^{m-1+k} = \gamma_i^k)] \end{array}$$

From the sequence $\{\eta_i^m\}$ we define a class $M_i^\eta \in \mathcal{T}_N^i\,(2 \leq i < N-1)$ as follows, cf. Definition 6.23.3:

$$M_i^\eta = M_i(M_i(\bar{\mathcal{X}}; \bar{\beta}) \cap \mathcal{X}_0) \cap \mathcal{X}^0$$

for $\mathcal{X}_m = M_{i+1}^{\eta_i^m} \in \mathcal{T}_N^{i+1}\,(0 \leq m \leq n)$, $\mathcal{X}^0 = M_{i+1}^\eta \in \mathcal{T}_N^{i+1}$, $\bar{\mathcal{X}} = (\mathcal{X}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{X}_n)$ and o.d.'s $\beta_m = st_i(\eta_i^{m-1})\,(0 < m \leq n)$.

From $\eta_i^m < \pi$, (21) for the case $i+1$ and (22) we have $\mathcal{X}^0 \preceq_{i+1} \mathcal{X}_0 \prec_{i+1} \mathcal{X}_1 \prec_{i+1} \cdots \prec_{i+1} \mathcal{X}_n \prec_{i+1} \mathrm{L}$ in the tree $\mathcal{T}_N^{i+1}$. Thus, cf. (20), $M_i^\eta \in \mathcal{T}_N^i$. We verify that (21) holds for the case i. Assume $\eta = pd_i(\gamma)$, and let $\mathcal{X} = M_i^\eta$ and

$$\mathcal{V} = M_i^\gamma = M_i(M_i(\bar{\mathcal{V}}; \bar{\gamma}) \cap \mathcal{V}_0) \cap \mathcal{V}^0$$

for $\mathcal{V}_m = M_{i+1}^{\gamma_i^m} \in \mathcal{T}_N^{i+1}\,(0 \leq m < lh_i(\gamma))$, $\mathcal{V}^0 = M_{i+1}^{\gamma} \in \mathcal{T}_N^{i+1}$ and o.d.'s $\gamma_m = st_i(\gamma_i^{m-1})\,(0 < m < lh_i(\gamma))$. We show $\mathcal{V} \prec_i \mathcal{X}$.

Case1 $\eta = pd_i(\gamma) = pd_{i+1}(\gamma)$: Then $lh_i(\gamma) = lh_i(\eta)\,\&\,\forall m < lh_i(\gamma)[\gamma_i^m = \eta_i^m]$ and $\gamma \prec_{i+1} \eta$. Hence $\mathcal{X}_m = \mathcal{V}_m\,\&\,\bar{\beta} = \bar{\gamma}\,\&\,\mathcal{V}^0 \prec_{i+1} \mathcal{X}^0$. This means $\mathcal{V}$ is a first son $\mathcal{Y}$ of $\mathcal{X}$ in $\mathcal{T}_N^i$. Therefore $\mathcal{V} \prec_i \mathcal{X}$.

Case2 $rg_i(\gamma) = pd_i(\gamma) = \eta$: Then $\gamma_i^0 = \gamma$, $\forall m < lh_i(\eta) = lh_i(\gamma) - 1[\eta_i^m = \gamma_i^{1+m}]$. By (22) we have $\gamma = \gamma_i^0 \prec_{i+1} \gamma_i^1 = \eta_i^0$ and hence $\bar{\mathcal{V}} = \bar{\mathcal{X}} * (\mathcal{V}_0)\,\&\,\bar{\gamma} = \bar{\beta} * (\gamma_1)\,\&\,\mathcal{V}^0 = \mathcal{V}_0 \prec_{i+1} \mathcal{X}_0$. This means that $\mathcal{V}$ is a second son $\mathcal{Z}$ of $\mathcal{X}$ in $\mathcal{T}_N^i$. Therefore $\mathcal{V} \prec_i \mathcal{X}$.

Case3 $\eta = pd_i(\gamma) \prec_i rg_i(\gamma)$: Then we have $\gamma_i^0 = \gamma$, $rg_i(\eta_i^{m-1}) = rg_i(\gamma)$ and $st_i(\eta_i^{m-1}) > st_i(\gamma)\,\&\,\forall k < lh_i(\eta) - m + 1 = lh_i(\gamma)(k > 0 \to \eta_i^{m-1+k} = \gamma_i^k)$ for some m with $0 < m \leq lh_i(\eta) - 1 = n$. In particular $\gamma = \gamma_i^0 \prec_{i+1} \gamma_i^1 = \eta_i^m$. Hence $\bar{\mathcal{V}} = \bar{\mathcal{X}} \uparrow m\,\&\,\bar{\gamma} = \bar{\beta} \uparrow (m+1) * (\gamma_m)\,\&\,\mathcal{V}^0 = \mathcal{V}_0 \prec_{i+1} \mathcal{V}_1 = \mathcal{X}_m$. This means $\mathcal{V}$ is a third son $\mathcal{U}$ of $\mathcal{X}$ in $\mathcal{T}_N^i$. Therefore $\mathcal{V} \prec_i \mathcal{X}$.

This completes a proof of (21), cf. Lemma 6.26. Our proof is based on the fact that the ramification procedure that produces three sons $\mathcal{Y}$, $\mathcal{Z}$ and $\mathcal{U}$ from $\mathcal{X}$ imitates the decomposition procedure of the relation $\eta = pd_i(\gamma)$ in terms of sequences $\{\gamma_i^m\}$ and $\{\eta_i^m\}$, and the relation $\prec_{i+1}$ between them, cf. Subsection 4.6.

In particular if $\gamma \prec_2 \eta$, then $M_2^\gamma \prec_2 M_2^\eta$, i.e., every $P \in M_2^\eta$ is Π_2-reflecting on the class M_2^γ. This means that every $P \in M_2^\eta$ is η-Mahlo.

Next we show the existence of an η-Mahlo set. Corresponding to the construction tree of the class $M^\eta = M_2^\eta \in \mathcal{T}_N$ we can associate a tree $\{\eta(s) : s \in Tree(\eta)\}$ of o.d.'s in $\{\beta < \pi : \eta \preceq \beta\}$ with its depth $N-2$. First for the empty sequence $\langle\rangle$ $\eta(\langle\rangle) = \eta$. For each nonleaf $s \in Tree(\eta)$ let $\{s_m : -1 \leq m \leq n\}$ be sons of s in $Tree(\eta)$ with $n = lh_i(\eta(s)) - 1 \geq 0$ and $s_m = s * (m)$. Then $\eta(s_{-1}) = \eta(s), \eta(s_m) = (\eta(s))_i^m$ for $0 \leq m \leq n$, where $N - 1 > i = dp(s) + 2$ with the depth $dp(s)$ of s, e.g., $dp(\langle\rangle) = 0$. s is a leaf if $dp(s) = N-3$.

For each $s \in Tree(\eta)$ we associate a Π_N-class $\mathcal{X}(s;\eta) \in \mathcal{T}_N^i$ with $i = dp(s)+2$ as follows. For a leaf s put $\mathcal{X}(s;\eta) = M_{N-1}^{st_{N-1}(\eta(s))}(\mathrm{L}) \in \mathcal{T}_N^{N-1}$. Suppose s is a nonleaf node and let $\{s_m : -1 \leq m \leq n\}$ be sons of s. Then put $\mathcal{X}(s;\eta) = M_i^{\eta(s)} \in \mathcal{T}_N^i$ with $i = dp(s) + 2$. Thus $\mathcal{X}(\langle\rangle;\eta) = M_2^\eta$.

Now we show

$$\forall s \in Tree(\eta)[\mathrm{L} \in \mathcal{X}(s;\eta)] \tag{23}$$

by tree induction on $s \in Tree(\eta)$ as follows.

For a leaf s we have $\eta(s) < \pi$, and hence $\mathrm{L} \in \mathcal{X}(s;\eta) = M_{N-1}^{st_{N-1}(\eta(s))}(\mathrm{L}) \in \mathcal{T}_N^{N-1}$ by induction on o.d.'s $st_{N-1}(\eta(s)) < \varepsilon_{\pi+1}$.

Suppose s is a nonleaf node with $i = dp(s) + 2 < N - 1$ and let $\{s_m : -1 \leq m \leq n\}$ be sons of s. Then

$$\mathcal{X}(s;\eta) = M_i^{\eta(s)} = M_i(M_i(\bar{\mathcal{X}};\bar{\beta}) \cap \mathcal{X}(s_0;\eta)) \cap \mathcal{X}(s_{-1};\eta)$$

for $\bar{\mathcal{X}} = (\mathcal{X}(s_1;\eta), \ldots, \mathcal{X}(s_n;\eta))$ and o.d.'s $\beta_m = st_i((\eta(s))_i^{m-1})\,(0 < m \leq n)$.

By IH(=Induction Hypothesis) we have $\mathrm{L} \in \bigcap\{\mathcal{X}(s_m;\eta) : -1 \leq m \leq n\}$. If $n = 0$, then $\mathcal{X}(s;\eta) = M_i(\mathcal{X}(s_0;\eta)) \cap \mathcal{X}(s_{-1};\eta)$. Since $\mathcal{X}(s_m;\eta)$ are Π_N-

classes, a Π_N-reflecting universe L reflects these classes, i.e., $\mathrm{L} \in \mathcal{X}(s;\eta)$ by IH. Next assume $n > 0$. Then by IH we have $\mathrm{L} \in \mathcal{X}(s_n;\eta) \cap \mathcal{X}(s_{-1};\eta)$. Hence (18) yields $\mathrm{L} \in \mathcal{X}(s;\eta)$. This completes a proof of (23). In particular we have $\mathrm{L} \in \mathcal{X}(\langle\rangle;\eta) = M_2^\eta$. Once again by reflecting the Π_N-class M_2^η we conclude $\mathrm{L} \in M_2(M_2^\eta)$. Consequently $M_2^\eta \cap \mathrm{L} \neq \emptyset$. This shows the existence of a *set* in M_2^η, cf. Theorem 6.33.

Let us examine the above proofs of (21) and (23). First these are based on the fact $\eta_i^m < \pi$ for any $m < lh_i(\eta)$ and any i with $2 \leq i < N-1$. Our proof of (21) is based on the fact that the second sons $\mathcal{Z}$ in $\mathcal{T}_N^i$ $(2 \leq i < N-1)$ is less than its father $\mathcal{X}$ with respect to $\prec_i$: $\mathcal{Z} \prec_i \mathcal{X}$. The fact is based on (19), i.e., on (16). On the other side our proof of (23) is also based on the fact (18), i.e., on (15). These two facts (15) and (16) follow from (3), which in turn, is shown by induction on ordinals $\bar{\beta}$, i.e., by induction on ordinal diagrams $\beta_m = st_i((\eta(s))_i^{m-1})$ $(0 < m \leq n, 2 \leq i < N-1)$. Therefore we have to restrict o.d.'s to ones in wellfounded parts with respect to o.d.'s $st_i(\eta)$ $(2 \leq i < N-1)$ in advance, cf. Definition 6.2.12 of $V^*(X)$. Otherwise we would be in a circle, for the aim of (21) and (23) is to show that the system $Od(\Pi_N)$ of o.d.'s is wellfounded.

Furthermore our proof of (23) for leaves s is based on induction on o.d.'s $st_{N-1}(\eta(s)) < \varepsilon_{\pi+1}$. When we restirct o.d.'s to a suitable subclass, then we can show transfinite induction up to each $\alpha < \varepsilon_{\pi+1}$, cf. Lemma 3.20.5 in Subsection 3.2. In this way we can show (23) for *each* η in the subclass.

Note, here, that $\eta(s) < \pi$. If we would have $\eta(s) = \pi$ and put, e.g., $\mathcal{X}(s;\eta) = M_{N-1}^\pi = M_{N-1}^{\varepsilon_{\pi+1}}(\mathrm{L})$, then we would need to invoke induction up to $\varepsilon_{\pi+1} + 1$ in showing (23) for leaves s. If we would put $M_{N-1}^\pi = \{\mathrm{L}\}$, then, again, we would need to invoke induction up to $\varepsilon_{\pi+1} + 1$ in showing (21) for the case $N-1$. Therefore $\eta(s) < \pi$ is desired, cf. (26) in Definition 4.14 in Section 4.5.

This ends a set-theoretic explanation of o.d.'s.

4.5 The system $Od(\Pi_N)$

In this subsection we define the subsystem $Od(\Pi_N) \subset Od$ of ordinal diagrams.

For $\rho \in \mathcal{D}^Q \cap Od(\Pi_N)$, we define o.d.'s $rg_i(\rho), st_i(\rho), pd_i(\rho)$ and a pair $in_i(\rho)$ of o.d.'s for $2 \leq i < N$ and a set $In(\sigma) \subseteq \{i : 2 \leq i < N\}$. $st_i(\rho)$ and $rg_i(\rho)$ may be undefined. In this case we denote $st_i(\rho)\uparrow$ and $rg_i(\rho)\uparrow$. Otherwise we denote $st_i(\rho)\downarrow$ and $rg_i(\rho)\downarrow$.

Using $pd_i(\rho)$ we define a relation $\alpha \prec_i \beta$ and its reflexive closure $\alpha \preceq_i \beta$ as follows.

Definition 4.13 $\alpha \prec_i \beta$ denotes the transitive closure of the relation $\{(\alpha,\beta) : pd_i(\alpha) = \beta\}$, and $\alpha \preceq_i \beta$ its reflexive closure.

Definition 4.14 $Od(\Pi_N)$ The system $Od(\Pi_N)$ of o.d.'s is obtained from Od by restricting the construction $(\sigma, q, \alpha) \mapsto d_\sigma^q \alpha$ in Definition 2.1.3 as follows:

Assume $\alpha \in Od(\Pi_N)$ & $\sigma \in \{\pi\} \cup \mathcal{D}^Q$ & $q = \overline{j\kappa\tau\nu}$, where $q = \overline{j\kappa\tau\nu}$ denotes a sequence of *quadruples* $j_m\kappa_m\tau_m\nu_m \subseteq Od(\Pi_N)$ of length $l+1$ $(0 \leq l \leq N-1-j_0)$ such that

1. $2 \leq j_0 < j_1 < \cdots < j_l = N-1$,
2. $\kappa_l = \pi \,\&\, \sigma \preceq \kappa_m \, (m \leq l)$.
3. $\nu_l \in Od(\Pi_N)$,
$$\sigma = \pi \Rightarrow \nu_l \leq \alpha \tag{24}$$
cf. Lemma 4.19,
and
$$m < l \Rightarrow \nu_m < \kappa_m^+ \tag{25}$$
4. $\tau_0 = \sigma, \tau_m \in \{\pi\} \cup \mathcal{D}^Q, \sigma \preceq \tau_m \, (m \leq l)$ and
$$\tau_l = \pi \Rightarrow \sigma = \pi \tag{26}$$
Cf. Lemmata 4.16.5 and 4.18.4.

Put $\rho := d_\sigma^q \alpha \in \mathcal{D}_\sigma^Q \subseteq Od$. For this ρ define

1. $in_j(\rho) = st_j(\rho) rg_j(\rho)$ (a pair) and $pd_j(\rho)$: Given j with $2 \leq j < N$, put $m = \min\{m \leq l : j \leq j_m\}$.
    - (a) $pd_j(\rho) = \tau_m$.
    - (b) $\exists m \leq l (j = j_m)$: Then $st_j(\rho) = \nu_m$, $rg_j(\rho) = \kappa_m$.
    - (c) Otherwise: $in_j(\rho) = in_j(pd_j(\rho)) = in_j(\tau_m)$. If $in_j(\tau_m) = \emptyset$, then set $st_j(\rho)\uparrow, rg_j(\rho)\uparrow$.
2. $In(\rho) = \{j_m : m \leq l\}$.

Then $\rho \in Od(\Pi_N)$ if the following conditions are fulfilled besides (1) in Definition 2.1.3:

($\mathcal{D}$.1) Assume $i \in In(\rho)$. Put $\kappa = rg_i(\rho)$. Then

($\mathcal{D}$.11) $in_i(rg_i(\rho)) = in_i(pd_{i+1}(\rho))$, $rg_i(\rho) \preceq_i pd_{i+1}(\rho)$ and $pd_i(\rho) \neq pd_{i+1}(\rho)$ if $i < N-1$.
Also $pd_i(\rho) \preceq_i rg_i(\rho)$ for any i.
Cf. Lemma 4.18.4.

($\mathcal{D}$.12) One of the following holds:

($\mathcal{D}$.12.1) $rg_i(\rho) = pd_i(\rho) \,\&\, \mathcal{B}_{>\kappa}(st_i(\rho)) < b(\alpha_1)$ with $\rho \preceq \alpha_1 \in \mathcal{D}_\kappa$. Cf. Lemma 4.18.6.

($\mathcal{D}$.12.2) $rg_i(\rho) = rg_i(pd_i(\rho)) \,\&\, st_i(\rho) < st_i(pd_i(\rho))$.

($\mathcal{D}$.12.3) $rg_i(pd_i(\rho)) \prec_i \kappa \,\&\, \forall \tau (rg_i(pd_i(\rho)) \preceq_i \tau \prec_i \kappa \to rg_i(\tau) \preceq_i \kappa) \,\&\, st_i(\rho) < st_i(\sigma_1)$ with
$$\sigma_1 = \min\{\sigma_1 : rg_i(\sigma_1) = \kappa \,\&\, pd_i(\rho) \prec_i \sigma_1 \prec_i \kappa\}$$
and such a σ_1 exists.

Cf. Lemma 4.18.9.

($\mathcal{D}$.2)

$$\forall\kappa\leq rg_i(\rho)(K_\kappa st_i(\rho)<\rho) \tag{27}$$

for $i\in In(\rho)$.

Also note that $\alpha\prec_2\beta\Leftrightarrow\alpha\prec\beta$ for $\alpha,\beta\in\mathcal{D}^Q$.

In this subsection $X,Y,\ldots$ ranges over subsets of $Od(\Pi_N)$. Ordinal diagrams in $Od(\Pi_N)$ are denoted $\alpha,\beta,\gamma,\ldots$, while $\sigma,\tau,\ldots$ denote o.d.'s in the set $(R\cap Od(\Pi_N))\cup\{\infty\}$.

Lemma 4.15 *For $\alpha,\beta\in Od(\Pi_N)\cap\mathcal{D}^Q$*

$$\alpha\prec_{N-1}\beta\Rightarrow st_{N-1}(\alpha)<st_{N-1}(\beta)$$

Proof. This follows from the condition ($\mathcal{D}$.12.2). Note that for any $\alpha\in\mathcal{D}^Q$, $N-1\in In(\alpha)\,\&\,rg_{N-1}(\alpha)=\pi$. $\Box$

We establish elementary facts on the relations $\prec_i$.

Lemma 4.16 *1. The finite set $\{\tau:\sigma\prec_i\tau\}$ is linearly ordered by $\prec_i$.*

2. $\rho\prec_i pd_{i+1}(\rho)$, i.e., $\prec_{i+1}\subseteq\prec_i$. Also for $i<j$, $\rho\prec_i pd_j(\rho)$, i.e., $\prec_j\subseteq\prec_i$.

3. $[i,j)\cap In(\rho)=\emptyset\,\&\,i<j\Rightarrow\rho\prec_j pd_i(\rho)=pd_j(\rho)$.

4. $in_i(\rho)=in_i(pd_i(\rho))\ \Leftrightarrow\ i\notin In(\rho)$.

5. For each $\eta\in\mathcal{D}^Q$ and $i\in[2,N-1]$, $\max\{\eta_\pi<\pi:\eta\preceq_i\eta_\pi\}$ is the diagram η_π such that $\eta\preceq\eta_\pi\in\mathcal{D}_\pi$. Therefore $\alpha\prec\beta\in\mathcal{D}_\pi\Rightarrow\alpha\prec_i\beta$ for any $i\in[2,N-1]$.

6. Given γ,κ so that $\exists\sigma(\gamma\preceq_i\sigma\,\&\,rg_i(\sigma)=\kappa)$, put $\sigma=\max\{\sigma:\gamma\preceq_i\sigma\,\&\,rg_i(\sigma)=\kappa\}$. Then $i\in In(\sigma)\,\&\,\kappa=pd_i(\sigma)$.

Proof.

4.16.2. This follows from the condition ($\mathcal{D}$.11), $pd_i(\rho)\preceq_i pd_{i+1}(\rho)$.

4.16.4. By the definition we have the direction [$\Leftarrow$]. For [$\Rightarrow$] assume $i\in In(\rho)$. Then by the condition ($\mathcal{D}$.12) we have $in_i(\rho)\neq in_i(pd_i(\rho))$.

4.16.5. This is seen from the condition (26) and $pd_i(\rho)\preceq_i pd_{i+1}(\rho)$.

4.16.6. By the maximality of σ we have $i\in In(\sigma)$. In the condition ($\mathcal{D}$.12), the latter two subcases ($\mathcal{D}$.12.2), $\tau=rg_i(\sigma)=rg_i(pd_i(\sigma))$ and ($\mathcal{D}$.12.3), $\exists\sigma_1(rg_i(\sigma_1)=\tau\,\&\,pd_i(\sigma)\prec_i\sigma_1)$ are not the cases again by the maximality of σ. Hence the first subcase ($\mathcal{D}$.12.1), $\tau=pd_i(\sigma)$ must occur. $\Box$

Definition 4.17 Cf. Lemma 4.16.5.)
For each $\eta\in\mathcal{D}^Q$, η_π denotes the diagram η_π such that $\eta\preceq\eta_\pi\in\mathcal{D}_\pi$.

Lemma 4.18 *Assume $\kappa=rg_i(\rho)\downarrow$.*

1. $\rho\prec_i rg_i(\rho)$.

2. $st_i(\rho)<\kappa^+$.

3. *$\rho \prec_i \tau \,\&\, rg_i(\tau)\downarrow = \kappa \,\&\, i \in In(\rho) \Rightarrow st_i(\rho) < st_i(\tau)$.*

4. *$pd_i(\rho) = \pi \Rightarrow \rho \in \mathcal{D}_\pi \,\&\, In(\rho) = \{N-1\}$. Therefore $i < N-1 \Rightarrow rg_i(\rho) \leq pd_{i+1}(\rho) < \pi$.*

5. *For a $j > i$, if $i \in In(\rho)$ and $rg_j(\rho)\downarrow$, then $rg_i(\rho) \preceq_i rg_j(\rho)$.*

6. *$st_i(\rho) \leq \max\{b(\alpha_1), \pi\} \,\&\, \mathcal{B}_{>\kappa}(st_i(\rho)) < b(\alpha_1)$ with $\rho \preceq \alpha_1 \in \mathcal{D}_\kappa$. In fact we have $i < N-1 \Rightarrow st_i(\rho) < \pi$ and $st_{N-1}(\rho) \leq b(\alpha_1)$.*

7. *$\rho \prec_i \sigma \prec_i \tau \,\&\, in_i(\rho) = in_i(\tau) \Rightarrow in_i(\rho) = in_i(\sigma)$.*

8. *$N-1 > i \in In(\rho) \,\&\, rg_i(\rho) \preceq_i \delta \prec_i pd_{i+1}(\rho) \Rightarrow i \notin In(\delta)$. Therefore $rg_i(\rho) \preceq_{i+1} pd_{i+1}(\rho)$.*

9. *$\rho \prec_i \tau < rg_i(\rho) \Rightarrow rg_i(\tau) \preceq_i rg_i(\rho)$.*

Proof by induction on $\ell\rho$.
4.18.1. If $i \in In(\rho)$, then $\rho \prec_i pd_i(\rho) \preceq_i rg_i(\rho)$ by the condition ($\mathcal{D}$.11). Otherwise $pd_i(\rho) \prec_i rg_i(pd_i(\rho)) = rg_i(\rho)$ by IH.
4.18.2. This follows from the condition (25) in Definition 4.14 and the convention $\pi^+ = \infty$ for $\pi = rg_{N-1}(\rho)$.
4.18.3. By Lemma 4.18.1 we have $\rho \prec_i \tau \prec_i rg_i(\tau) = \kappa = rg_i(\rho)$. Thus by the condition ($\mathcal{D}$.12) one of the following cases occur:

($\mathcal{D}$.12.2) $rg_i(\rho) = rg_i(pd_i(\rho)) \,\&\, pd_i(\rho) \preceq_i \tau$: Then by IH $st_i(\rho) < st_i(pd_i(\rho)) \leq st_i(\tau)$,

or

($\mathcal{D}$.12.3) $rg_i(pd_i(\rho)) \prec_i \kappa$: Then $rg_i(pd_i(\rho)) \neq \kappa = rg_i(\tau)$ and hence $pd_i(\rho) \prec_i \tau$. Put $\sigma_1 = \min\{\sigma_1 : rg_i(\sigma_1) = \kappa \,\&\, pd_i(\rho) \prec_i \sigma_1 \prec_i \kappa\}$. Then $\sigma_1 \preceq_i \tau$. Therefore by IH $st_i(\rho) < st_i(\sigma_1) \leq st_i(\tau)$.

4.18.8. This is seen from Lemmata 4.18.7 and 4.16.4.
4.18.4. This is seen from the conditions (26) and ($\mathcal{D}$.11).
4.18.5. This is seen from the definition ($\mathcal{D}$.11) and Lemma 4.16.2.
4.18.6. By $\kappa = rg_i(\rho)\downarrow$ we have $\exists\sigma(\rho \preceq_i \sigma \,\&\, i \in In(\sigma) \,\&\, rg_i(\sigma) = \kappa)$. Let σ denote the maximal σ such that $\rho \preceq_i \sigma \,\&\, i \in In(\sigma) \,\&\, rg_i(\sigma) = \kappa$. Then by Lemma 4.16.6 $\kappa = pd_i(\sigma) = rg_i(\sigma)$. Hence by Lemmata 4.18.3 and 4.18.2 we have $st_i(\rho) \leq st_i(\sigma) < \kappa^+$. If $i < N-1$, then $\kappa = rg_i(\sigma) < \pi$ by Lemma 4.18.4. Otherwise $\kappa = rg_i(\sigma) = \pi \,\&\, \sigma = \alpha_1 \in \mathcal{D}_\pi$ by Lemma 4.16.6. Hence by the condition (24) in Definition 4.14 we have $st_i(\sigma) \leq b(\alpha_1)$. Therefore $st_i(\rho) \leq \max\{b(\alpha_1), \pi\}$.

It remains to show $\mathcal{B}_{>\kappa}(st_i(\rho)) < b(\alpha_1)$. Lemma 2.3 with $st_i(\rho) \leq st_i(\sigma) < \kappa^+$ yields $\forall\tau > \kappa[\mathcal{B}_\tau(st_i(\rho)) \leq \mathcal{B}_\tau(st_i(\sigma))]$, and hence $\mathcal{B}_{>\kappa}(st_i(\rho)) \leq \mathcal{B}_{>\kappa}(st_i(\sigma))$. On the other hand we have $\mathcal{B}_{>\kappa}(st_i(\sigma)) < b(\alpha_1)$ by the condition ($\mathcal{D}$.12.1) in Definition 4.14. Consequently $\mathcal{B}_{>\kappa}(st_i(\rho)) < b(\alpha_1)$.
4.18.7. This follows from Lemma 4.18.3 and IH.

4.18.9. First note that if $\rho \prec_i \tau < rg_i(\rho)$, then $\tau \prec_i rg_i(\rho)$ by Lemmata 4.18.1 and 4.16.1.

By IH and the condition ($\mathcal{D}$.12) we can assume $i \in In(\rho)$ and the case ($\mathcal{D}$.12.3), $rg_i(pd_i(\rho)) \prec_i \kappa$ occurs. Thus also assume $pd_i(\rho) \prec_i \tau$. If $rg_i(pd_i(\rho)) \preceq_i \tau \prec_i \kappa$, then the condition ($\mathcal{D}$.12.3) yields $rg_i(\tau) \preceq_i \kappa$. So assume $pd_i(\rho) \prec_i \tau \prec_i rg_i(pd_i(\rho))$. Then by IH we have $rg_i(\tau) \preceq_i rg_i(pd_i(\rho)) \prec_i \kappa$. □

Lemma 4.19 *For* $\rho \in \mathcal{D} \cap Od(\Pi_N)$*,* $Q(\rho) \leq \max\{b(\rho), \pi\}$*.*

Proof. By Definition 4.14 and (25) we have $In(\rho) \cup \{pd_i(\rho), rg_i(\rho) : i \in In(\rho)\} \cup \{st_i(\rho) : i \in In(\rho) \,\&\, i < N-1\} \leq \pi$. On the other hand we have $st_{N-1}(\rho) \leq b(\alpha_1) \leq b(\rho)$ by Lemmata 4.18.6 and 2.4 for the diagram α_1 with $\rho \preceq \alpha_1 \in \mathcal{D}_\pi$. □

4.6 A finer analysis of the relations $\prec_i$

In this subsection we give a finer analysis of the relation $\alpha \prec_i \beta$. This is needed in Sections 5 and 6.

First for each $\eta \in \mathcal{D}^Q$ and each $i \in [2, N-1) = \{i \in \omega : 2 \leq i < N-1\}$ define a length $lh_i(\eta)$ and a sequence $\{\eta_i^n : n < lh_i(\eta)\} \subseteq \{\delta < \pi : \eta \preceq \delta\}$ of subdiagrams of η. The sequence decomposes the sequence $\{\delta < \pi : \eta \preceq_{i+1} \delta\}$.

Definition 4.20 *Length* $lh_i(\eta)$ *and a sequence* $\{\eta_i^n : n < lh_i(\eta)\}$ *of subdiagrams of* $\eta \in \mathcal{D}^Q$

Case 4.20.1. $\neg\exists\delta(\eta \preceq_i \delta \,\&\, i \in In(\delta))$: Then put $lh_i(\eta) = 1$ and $\eta_i^0 := \eta_\pi$, cf. Definition 4.17. Namely η_i^0 denotes the maximal diagram such that $\eta \preceq_{i+1} \eta_i^0 < \pi$.

Case 4.20.2. $\exists\delta(\eta \preceq_i \delta \,\&\, i \in In(\delta))$: Then η_i^0 is defined to be the minimal diagram such that $\eta \preceq_i \eta_i^0 \,\&\, i \in In(\eta_i^0)$.

Suppose that η_i^n is defined so that $i \in In(\eta_i^n)$.

Subcase 4.20.2.1. $\exists\gamma(rg_i(\eta_i^n) \preceq_i \gamma \,\&\, i \in In(\gamma))$: Then η_i^{n+1} is defined to be the minimal diagram such that $rg_i(\eta_i^n) \preceq_i \eta_i^{n+1} \,\&\, i \in In(\eta_i^{n+1})$.

Subcase 4.20.2.2. Otherwise: Then $lh_i(\eta) = n+2$ and define η_i^{n+1} to be the maximal diagram such that $\eta_i^n \preceq_{i+1} \eta_i^{n+1} < \pi$, i.e., the diagram such that $\eta \preceq \eta_i^{n+1} \in \mathcal{D}_\pi$.

Lemma 4.21

$$\eta_i^n = \gamma_i^m \Rightarrow \forall k < lh_i(\eta) - n = lh_i(\gamma) - m\{\eta_i^{n+k} = \gamma_i^{m+k}\}$$

and

$$rg_i(\eta_i^n) = rg_i(\gamma_i^m) \Rightarrow \forall k < lh_i(\eta) - n = lh_i(\gamma) - m\{k > 0 \to \eta_i^{n+k} = \gamma_i^{m+k}\}.$$

Proof. The first assertion is clear. Assume $rg_i(\eta_i^n) = rg_i(\gamma_i^m)$. Then $\eta_i^{n+1} = \gamma_i^{m+1}$, and hence the second assertion follows from the first one. □

Lemma 4.22 *For* $i < N-1$*,*

$$\forall\delta[rg_i(\eta_i^n) \preceq_i \delta \prec_i pd_{i+1}(\eta_i^n) \Rightarrow i \notin In(\delta)] \,\&\, \eta \preceq_{i+1} \eta_i^0 \,\&\, \forall n < lh_i(\eta)-1[\eta_i^n \prec_{i+1} \eta_i^{n+1}].$$

Proof. First we show $\eta \preceq_{i+1} \eta^0_i$. By the definition and Lemma 4.16.5 we can assume that η^0_i is the minimal diagram such that $\eta \preceq_i \eta^0_i \,\&\, i \in In(\eta^0_i)$, i.e, **Case 4.20.2**. Then $i \not\in In(\delta)$ for any δ with $\eta \preceq_i \delta \prec_i \eta^0_i$, and hence the assertion follows from Lemma 4.16.3.

Next we show $\forall\delta[rg_i(\eta^n_i) \preceq_i \delta \prec_i pd_{i+1}(\eta^n_i) \Rightarrow i \not\in In(\delta)]$. By the condition $(\mathcal{D}.11)$, $in_i(rg_i(\eta^n_i)) = in_i(pd_{i+1}(\eta^n_i)) \,\&\, rg_i(\eta^n_i) \preceq_i pd_{i+1}(\eta^n_i)$, Lemma 4.18.8 we have

$$\forall\delta[rg_i(\eta^n_i) \preceq_i \delta \prec_i pd_{i+1}(\eta^n_i) \Rightarrow i \not\in In(\delta)].$$

Finally we show $\eta^n_i \prec_{i+1} \eta^{n+1}_i$. We can assume, by Lemma 4.16.5, that η^{n+1}_i is the minimal diagram such that $rg_i(\eta^n_i) \preceq_i \eta^{n+1}_i \,\&\, i \in In(\eta^{n+1}_i)$, i.e., **Subcase 4.20.2.1**. We have by the definition that η^{n+1}_i is the diagram such that $rg_i(\eta^n_i) \preceq_i \eta^{n+1}_i$ and

$$\forall\delta[rg_i(\eta^n_i) \preceq_i \delta \prec_i \eta^{n+1}_i \Rightarrow i \not\in In(\delta)] \,\&\, i \in In(\eta^{n+1}_i).$$

Therefore $pd_{i+1}(\eta^n_i) \preceq_i \eta^{n+1}_i$ and $\forall\delta[pd_{i+1}(\eta^n_i) \preceq_i \delta \prec_i \eta^{n+1}_i \Rightarrow i \not\in In(\delta)]$. Hence $\eta^n_i \prec_{i+1} pd_{i+1}(\eta^n_i) \preceq_{i+1} \eta^{n+1}_i$. □

Lemma 4.23

$$\gamma \prec_i \eta \prec_i \kappa = rg_i(\gamma)\!\downarrow \Rightarrow \exists m < lh_i(\eta) - 1[\kappa = rg_i(\eta^m_i)].$$

Proof by induction on $\ell\eta$. Put

$$\sigma = \max\{\sigma : \gamma \preceq_i \sigma \prec_i \kappa \,\&\, rg_i(\sigma) = \kappa\}.$$

Then by Lemma 4.16.6 we have $i \in In(\sigma) \,\&\, \kappa = pd_i(\sigma)$. Hence $\eta \preceq_i \sigma$. If $\eta = \sigma$, then $\kappa = rg_i(\eta^0_i)$ with $\eta^0_i = \eta$. Assume $\eta \prec_i \sigma$. If $i \not\in In(\eta)$, then we have $\gamma \prec_i pd_i(\eta) \preceq_i \sigma \prec_i \kappa$. IH with $(pd_i(\eta))^m_i = \eta^m_i$ yields the assertion. Suppose $i \in In(\eta)$. By Lemma 4.18.9 we have $rg_i(\eta) \preceq_i \kappa$. If $rg_i(\eta) = \kappa$, then we are done by $\eta^0_i = \eta$. Suppose $rg_i(\eta) \prec_i \kappa$. Then we have $\eta^1_i \preceq_i \sigma$ by the definition, and hence $\gamma \prec_i \eta^1_i \prec_i \kappa$. IH with $\eta^m_i = (\eta^1_i)^{m-1}_i$ yields the assertion. □

Lemma 4.24 *Assume $\eta = pd_i(\gamma)$ for an $i < N - 1$. Then one of the following holds, cf. Subsection 4.4:*

Case 4.24.1 $\eta = pd_{i+1}(\gamma) \,\&\, \gamma^0_i = \eta^0_i$. *Hence*

$$\eta = pd_i(\gamma) = pd_{i+1}(\gamma) \,\&\, lh_i(\gamma) = lh_i(\eta) \,\&\, \forall m < lh_i(\gamma)[\gamma^m_i = \eta^m_i]$$

Case 4.24.2 $rg_i(\gamma) = pd_i(\gamma) = \eta \,\&\, \gamma^0_i = \gamma \,\&\, \gamma^1_i = \eta^0_i$. *Hence*

$$rg_i(\gamma) = pd_i(\gamma) = \eta \,\&\, \gamma^0_i = \gamma \,\&\, \forall m < lh_i(\eta) = lh_i(\gamma) - 1[\eta^m_i = \gamma^{1+m}_i]$$

Case 4.24.3 $\eta = pd_i(\gamma) \prec_i rg_i(\gamma) \,\&\, \gamma^0_i = \gamma$ *and* $rg_i(\eta^m_i) = rg_i(\gamma) \,\&\, st_i(\eta^m_i) > st_i(\gamma)$ *for an* $m < lh_i(\eta) - 1$. *Hence*

$$\begin{aligned}&\eta = pd_i(\gamma) \prec_i rg_i(\gamma) \,\&\, \gamma^0_i = \gamma \,\&\\ &\exists m[0 < m \leq lh_i(\eta) - 1 \,\&\, rg_i(\eta^{m-1}_i) = rg_i(\gamma) \,\&\, st_i(\eta^{m-1}_i) > st_i(\gamma) \,\&\\ &\forall k < lh_i(\eta) - m + 1 = lh_i(\gamma)(k > 0 \to \eta^{m-1+k}_i = \gamma^k_i)]\end{aligned}$$

Proof. Assume $\eta = pd_i(\gamma)$ for an $i < N-1$.

First consider the case $i \notin In(\gamma)$. Then by the definition $\eta = pd_{i+1}(\gamma) \,\&\, \gamma_i^0 = \eta_i^0$ holds. Hence by Lemma 4.21 **Case 4.24.1** holds.

In what follws suppose $i \in In(\gamma)$. Then $\gamma_i^0 = \gamma$ and $\eta = pd_i(\gamma) \preceq_i rg_i(\gamma)$ by Lemma 4.18.1, i.e., by the condition $(\mathcal{D}.11)$. Second consider the case $rg_i(\gamma) = pd_i(\gamma) = \eta$. Then by the definition we have $\gamma_i^1 = \eta_i^0$. Therefore by Lemma 4.21 **Case 4.24.2** holds.

Finally consider the case $\eta = pd_i(\gamma) \prec_i rg_i(\gamma)$. Then by Lemma 4.23 we have $rg_i(\eta_i^m) = rg_i(\gamma) \,\&\, st_i(\eta_i^m) > st_i(\gamma)$ for an $m < lh_i(\eta) - 1$. Consequently by Lemma 4.21 **Case 4.24.3** holds. □

Definition 4.25 *1.* For $2 \leq i < N-1$ define

$$\alpha \lhd_i \beta :\Leftrightarrow \alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{D}^Q \,\&\, i \in In(\alpha) \,\&\, \alpha \prec_i \beta \prec_i rg_i(\alpha).$$

2. For $2 \leq i < N-1$ define

$$\alpha \lhd^i \beta :\Leftrightarrow \alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{D}^Q \,\&\, i \in In(\alpha) \,\&\, rg_i(\alpha) \preceq_i \beta \prec_i pd_{i+1}(\alpha).$$

The following lemma is seen from Lemma 4.24.

Lemma 4.26 *Assume $\gamma \prec_i \eta$ for an $i < N-1$. Then one of the following holds*

Case 4.26.1 $\gamma_i^0 = \eta_i^0 \,\&\, \gamma \prec_{i+1} \eta$.

Case 4.26.2 $\exists n \in (0, lh_i(\gamma))[\gamma_i^n = \eta_i^0]$, *and* $\gamma_i^{n-1} \lhd^i \eta$.

Case 4.26.3 $\exists n \in [0, lh_i(\gamma)-1] \exists m \in [0, lh_i(\eta)-1][\gamma_i^n \prec_i \eta \preceq_i \eta_i^m \,\&\, rg_i(\gamma_i^n) = rg_i(\eta_i^m)]$, *and* $\gamma_i^n \lhd_i \eta$.

Lemma 4.27 $\alpha \in \mathcal{D}_\pi \,\&\, i < N-1 \Rightarrow \gamma \not\lhd_i \alpha$.

Proof. This follows from Lemma 4.18.4. □

4.7 Decomposing ordinal diagrams

In this subsection we introduce decompositions $\alpha(s)$ of ordinal diagrams α, where s denotes a function in ${}^{[i,k)}2\ (2 \leq i \leq k \leq N-3)$. In the next section 5 we define a suitable Π^0_{N-1}-operator Γ_N through the decompositions.

Definition 4.28 For an o.d.'s $\eta \in \mathcal{D}^Q, i < N-1$ define as follows:

1.

$$ppd_i(\eta) := \begin{cases} rg_i(\eta), & \text{if } i \in In(\eta) \\ pd_i(\eta), & \text{if } i \notin In(\eta) \end{cases}$$

2.

$$\gamma \prec^p_i \alpha :\Leftrightarrow \gamma \prec_i \alpha \,\&\, \neg\exists n < lh_i(\gamma)[\gamma^n_i \lhd_i \alpha]$$

and $\gamma \preceq^p_i \alpha$ denotes the reflexive closure of the relation $\gamma \prec^p_i \alpha$.

Lemma 4.29 *1. $\gamma \prec^p_i \alpha$ is the transitive closure of the relation $\{(\alpha,\beta) : \beta = ppd_i(\alpha)\}$, and hence $\prec^p_i$ is transitive and $\prec_{i+1} \subseteq \prec^p_i \subseteq \prec_i$.*

2. $\alpha \prec_i \beta \Rightarrow \exists\gamma[\alpha \preceq^p_i \gamma \,\&\, (ppd_i(\gamma) = \beta \vee \gamma \lhd_i \beta)]$.

3. $\alpha \preceq^p_i \beta \Rightarrow \alpha \preceq_{i+1} \beta^0_i$.

Proof.
4.29.1. This is seen from Lemmata 4.22, 4.26 and 4.18.1.
4.29.2. This is seen from Lemma 4.29.1.
4.29.3. By induction on $\ell\alpha$ and $\alpha \preceq_{i+1} \alpha^0_i$ we can assume that $\beta = ppd_i(\alpha)$.
If $i \notin In(\alpha)$, then $\beta = pd_i(\alpha) = pd_{i+1}(\alpha)$, and hence $\alpha \prec_{i+1} \beta \preceq_{i+1} \beta^0_i$.
Suppose $i \in In(\alpha)$ and $\beta = rg_i(\alpha)$. Then $\alpha = \alpha^0_i \,\&\, \beta^0_i = \alpha^1_i$. Hence Lemma 4.22 yields $\alpha \prec_{i+1} \beta^0_i$. □

Definition 4.30 For $\alpha \in \mathcal{D}^Q$ let $\overline{st}_{N-1}(\alpha)$ denote the pair

$$\overline{st}_{N-1}(\alpha) := \langle st_{N-1}(\alpha^0_{N-2}), st_{N-1}(\alpha)\rangle$$

Lemma 4.31 *For any $\alpha \in \mathcal{D}^Q$ and $\alpha \preceq \alpha_\pi \in \mathcal{D}_\pi$, $st_{N-1}(\alpha) \leq st_{N-1}(\alpha^0_{N-2}) \leq b(\alpha_\pi)$.*

Proof. By Lemma 4.22 we have $\alpha \preceq_{N-1} \alpha^0_{N-2}$. Hence Lemma 4.15 yields $st_{N-1}(\alpha) \leq st_{N-1}(\alpha^0_{N-2})$. $st_{N-1}(\alpha^0_{N-2}) \leq b(\alpha_\pi)$ is seen from 4.18.6. □

Lemma 4.32 *$\gamma \prec^p_{N-2} \alpha \Rightarrow \overline{st}_{N-1}(\gamma) <_{lex} \overline{st}_{N-1}(\alpha)$.*

Proof. Assume $\gamma \prec^p_{N-2} \alpha$. Then by Lemma 4.26 one of the following holds:
Case 4.26.1 $\gamma^0_{N-2} = \alpha^0_{N-2} \,\&\, \gamma \prec_{N-1} \alpha$: Then $st_{N-1}(\gamma^0_{N-2}) = st_{N-1}(\alpha^0_{N-2})$. Lemma 4.15 yields $st_{N-1}(\gamma) < st_{N-1}(\alpha)$. Hence $\overline{st}_{N-1}(\gamma) <_{lex} \overline{st}_{N-1}(\alpha)$.
Case 4.26.2 $\exists n \in (0, lh_{N-2}(\gamma))[\gamma^n_{N-2} = \alpha^0_{N-2}]$: By $n > 0$ we have $\gamma^0_{N-2} \prec_{N-1} \gamma^n_{N-2}$ by Lemma 4.22, and hence $st_{N-1}(\gamma^0_{N-2}) < st_{N-1}(\gamma^n_{N-2}) = st_{N-1}(\alpha^0_{N-2})$ by Lemma 4.15. Therefore $\overline{st}_{N-1}(\gamma) <_{lex} \overline{st}_{N-1}(\alpha)$.
Case 4.26.3 $\exists n \in [0, lh_{N-2}(\gamma)-1)\exists m \in [0, lh_{N-2}(\alpha)-1)[\gamma^n_{N-2} \prec_{N-2} \alpha \preceq_{N-2} \alpha^m_{N-2} \,\&\, rg_{N-2}(\gamma^n_{N-2}) = rg_{N-2}(\alpha^m_{N-2})]$: Then $\gamma^n_{N-2} \lhd_{N-2} \alpha$. Hence this is not the case. □

Definition 4.33 $I := I_N := \bigcup\{{}^{[i,k)}2 : 2 \leq i \leq k \leq N-3\}$ denotes the set of functions from the set $[i,k) = \{j \in \omega : i \leq j < k\}$ to $2 = \{0,1\}$.

1. For $s \in {}^{[i,k)}2$ let

$$\begin{array}{rcl} d(s) & := & i \\ \ell(s) & := & k \\ \#s & := & \#\{j \in [i,k) : s(j) = 1\} \end{array}$$

Note that there are $(N-4)$ empty functions in I. Each element in I is, by definition, a triple of a function s and $d(s), \ell(s)$. An empty function is, then, a triple $(\emptyset, i, i)\,(2 \leq i \leq N-3)$.

If $\#s = 0$, then s is said to be *null.*

2. For $s \in I$, $s|i$ denotes the function in I such that $d(s|i) = d(s)$, $\ell(s|i) = \min\{\max(i, d(s)), \ell(s)\}$ and $(s|i)(j) := s(j)$ for $d(s|i) \leq j < \ell(s|i)$.

3. For $s, t \in I$, $s <_{lex} t$ denotes the lexicographic ordering induced by $0 < 1$:

$$s <_{lex} t :\Leftrightarrow \exists i \in [d(s), \ell(s)) \cap [d(t), \ell(t))\{s|i = t|i \,\&\, s(i) = 0 < 1 = t(i)\}.$$

Note that $s <_{lex} t \Rightarrow d(s) = d(t)$.

4. For $s, t \in I$ with $\ell(s) = d(t)$, $u = s * t$ denotes the concatenated sequence. Namely $d(u) = d(s), \ell(u) = \ell(t)$ and $u(i) = s(i)$ for $i \in [d(s), \ell(s))$, $u(i) = t(i)$ for $i \in [d(t), \ell(t))$.

5. $s \in I$ is said to be *unitary* if

$$\forall i \in [d(s), \ell(s))\{s(i) = 1 \Rightarrow i = \ell(s) - 1\} \,\&\, \forall j \in [d(s), \ell(s) - 1)\{s(j) = 0\}.$$

6. Each $s \in I$ is decomposed uniquely to the concatenated sequence of longest unitary components s_i, $s = s_0 * \cdots * s_k$ $(k \geq 0)$ such that $\{d(s)\} \cup \{i+1 \in (d(s), \ell(s)] : s(i) = 1\} \cup \{\ell(s)\} = \{\ell_{-1} < \ell_0 < \cdots < \ell_k\}$ $(k \geq 0)$ and each $s_i \in {}^{[\ell_{i-1}, \ell_i)}2$ is a subseries of s.

$s = s_0 * \cdots * s_k$ is said to be the *unitary decomposition* of s.

7. If $d(s) = 2$, then s is said to be *initial.*

$I(2) := \{s \in I : d(s) = 2\}$ denotes the set of initial sequences in I.

8. $I(2, N-2) := \{s \in I : d(s) = 2 \,\&\, \ell(s) = N-2\}$.

9. $t \subseteq_e s$ $[t \subset_e s]$ designates that t is an [a proper] *initial segment* of s , i.e., $\exists i \leq \ell(s)\{t = s|i\}$ $[\exists i < \ell(s)\{t = s|i\}]$, resp.

10. For $s, t \in I$ with $d(s) = d(t)$, $s \cap t$ denotes a sequence in I defined as follows:

$$(s \cap t)(i) = j :\Leftrightarrow \forall k < i[s(k) = t(k)] \,\&\, s(i) = t(i) = j.$$

$d(s \cap t) = d(s)$ and $\ell(s \cap t) = \min(\{i : s(i) \neq t(i)\} \cup \{\ell(s), \ell(t)\})$.

Definition 4.34 Let $\alpha \in \mathcal{D}^Q$. We define ordinal diagrams $\alpha(s)\,(s \in I)$ as follows:

1. First define $\alpha(s)$ for unitary s by induction on $\ell\alpha$ as follows:
   (a) $\alpha(s) := \alpha$ if s is null.
   (b) Otherwise $s(\ell(s)-1) = 1 \,\&\, \forall i \in [d(s), \ell(s)-1)\{s(i) = 0\}$.
   Case 1 If
   $$\forall i \in [d(s), \ell(s)-1)\{\alpha^0_{\ell(s)-1} < \alpha^0_i \,\&\, rg_{\ell(s)-1}(\alpha) \leq \alpha^0_i\} \tag{28}$$
   then put
   $$\alpha(s) := \min\{\delta : \alpha^0_{\ell(s)-1} \preceq^p_{\ell(s)} \delta < \alpha'(s)\},$$
   where
   $$\alpha' = \min(\{\alpha^0_i : i \in [d(s), \ell(s)-1)\} \cup \{\alpha^1_{\ell(s)-1}\}).$$
   Case 2 Otherwise: Then put, cf. Definition 4.17,
   $$\alpha(s) := \alpha_\pi.$$
2. $\alpha(s)$ is defined through the unitary decomposition $s = s_0 * s_1 * \cdots * s_k$ as follows
   $$\alpha(s) := (\cdots(\alpha(s_0))(s_1)\cdots)(s_k).$$

Definition 4.35 Let $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{D}^Q$.

1. Let $2 \leq k \leq N-3$. Define $s[k;\alpha,\beta] \in {}^{[k,N-3]}2$ recursively. Suppose that $s = (s[k;\alpha,\beta])|i$ has been defined for an i with $k \leq i \leq N-3$. Then $s[k;\alpha,\beta](i) \in \{0,1\}$ is defined as follows:
   $$s[k;\alpha,\beta](i) := \left\{\begin{array}{ll} 1 & \text{if } \exists\gamma[\alpha(s) \preceq_i \gamma \prec_i \beta(s) \,\&\, i \in In(\gamma)] \\ 0 & \text{otheriwse} \end{array}\right. \tag{29}$$
2. $$t \subseteq s[\alpha,\beta] :\Leftrightarrow \forall i \in [d(t), \ell(t))\{t(i) = s[d(t);\alpha,\beta](i)\}.$$

Lemma 4.36 *1.* $\alpha(s|i) = \beta(s|i) \Rightarrow \alpha(s) = \beta(s)$.

2. Let s be unitary with $s(\ell(s)-1) = 1$. Assume $\alpha \prec_{d(s)} \beta$ and $\forall i \in [d(s), \ell(s))[\alpha^0_i \geq \beta]$. Then $\alpha(s) = \beta(s)$.

3. Let s be unitary with $s(\ell(s)-1) = 1$. Then $\alpha \preceq_{\ell(s)} \alpha^0_{\ell(s)-1} \preceq^p_{\ell(s)} \alpha(s)$.

4. *Let* $\alpha \prec \delta \prec \gamma$. *For an initial* t, *assume* $t \not\subseteq_e s[2;\alpha,\delta]$, $t \subseteq_e s[2;\alpha,\gamma]$ *and* $\delta \prec_{t|(\ell(t)-1)} \gamma$.

   Then $t(i) = 1$ *for* $i = \min\{i : t(i) \neq s[2;\alpha,\delta](i)\}$, *and hence*

$$s[2;\alpha,\delta] <_{lex} t.$$

5. $u = s * t \,\&\, \ell(s) \in In(\alpha(s)) \,\&\, rg_{\ell(u)}(\alpha(u))\!\downarrow \Rightarrow rg_{\ell(s)}(\alpha(s)) \preceq rg_{\ell(u)}(\alpha(u))$.

Proof.
4.36.1. Let $s = (s|i) * t$. If t is null, then $\alpha(s) = \alpha(s|i) = \beta(s|i) = \beta(s)$. Otherwise let $s = s_0 * \cdots * s_k$ be the unitary decomposition of s, and $s_j = s' * t'$ with $s|i = s_0 * \cdots * s_{j-1} * s'$ and $t = t' * s_{j+1} * \cdots * s_k$. Then $\alpha(s|i) = \alpha(s_0 * \cdots * s_{j-1})$ and similarly for $\beta(s|i)$. By Definition 4.34.1 we have $\alpha(s_0 * \cdots * s_j) = \beta(s_0 * \cdots * s_j)$, and we see inductively $\alpha(s) = \beta(s)$.
4.36.2. We have $\forall i \in [d(s),\ell(s))[\alpha \prec_i \beta]$ by Lemma 4.16.3. Also we have $\forall i \in [d(s),\ell(s))[\alpha^0_i = \beta^0_i$ and $\alpha^1_{\ell(s)-1} = \beta^1_{\ell(s)-1}$. By Definition 4.34.1 we have $\alpha(s) = \beta(s)$.
4.36.3. This is seen from Lemmata 4.16.5, 4.18.4 and 4.22.
4.36.4. Suppose $t(i) = 0$. Then $s[2;\alpha,\delta](i) = 1$. By the minimality of i we have $(s[2;\alpha,\gamma])|i = t|i = (s[2;\alpha,\delta])|i$, and hence $\alpha(t|i) \preceq_i \eta \prec_i \delta(t|i)$ for an η by the definition (29). On the other hand we have $\delta(t|i) \prec_i \gamma(t|i)$ by $\delta \prec_{t|(\ell(t)-1)} \gamma$. Therefore $t(i) = s[2;\alpha,\gamma](i) = 1$. A contradiction.
4.36.5. If $\alpha(u) = \alpha(s)$, then the assertion follows from the assumption $\ell(s) \in In(\alpha(s))$ and Lemma 4.18.5.

Suppose $\alpha(u) > \alpha(s)$. Then t is not null. Let t_1 be the longest unitary subseries of t such that for some t_0, t_2, $t = t_0 * t_1 * t_2$, $\alpha(s) = \alpha(s * t_0)$ and $\alpha(s) < \alpha(s * t_0 * t_1)$.

$\alpha(s * t_0 * t_1)$ is defined by the **Case 1** in Definition 4.34. Otherwise we would have $\alpha(u) = \alpha(s * t_0 * t_1) = \alpha_\pi$, and $rg_{\ell(u)}(\alpha(u)) \uparrow$. Therefore we have $\alpha(s) = \alpha(s * t_0) \prec_{\ell(t_1)} \alpha(s * t_0 * t_1)$ with $\ell(s) < \ell(t_1)$. Hence $rg_{\ell(s)}(\alpha(s)) \preceq \alpha(s * t_0 * t_1) \preceq \alpha(u) \prec rg_{\ell(u)}(\alpha(u))$. □

Definition 4.37 Let $\alpha \in \mathcal{D}^Q$ and $s \in I$.

1. $$\alpha \prec_s \beta :\Leftrightarrow s \subseteq s[\alpha,\beta] \,\&\, \forall t \subseteq_e s[\alpha(t) \prec^p_{\ell(t)} \beta(t)].$$

2. $$\alpha \prec^-_s \beta :\Leftrightarrow s \subseteq s[\alpha,\beta] \,\&\, \forall t \subseteq_e s[\#t < \#(u * s) \Rightarrow \alpha(t) \prec^p_{\ell(t)} \beta(t)].$$

3. $$\alpha \lhd_s \beta :\Leftrightarrow s \subseteq s[\alpha,\beta] \,\&\, (\ell(s) > d(s) \Rightarrow \alpha \prec_{s|(\ell(s)-1)} \beta) \,\&\, \alpha(s) \lhd_{\ell(s)} \beta(s),$$

   cf. Definition 4.25.1.

4. $\alpha \lhd_s^+ \beta$ iff $\alpha \lhd_s \beta$ and for each $i \in [d(s), \ell(s))$ if $s(i) = 1 \,\&\, i \not\in In(\alpha(s|i))$, then there are sequences $\{\alpha_k\}_{k\leq K}$ of diagrams and a sequence $\{v_k\}_{k<K} \subseteq I$ such that

$$\alpha_K = \alpha(s|i) \,\&\, \alpha_0 = (\alpha_K)_i^0 \,\&\, \forall k < K\{\alpha_{k+1} \lhd_{v_k} \alpha_k \,\&\, d(v_k) = i\} \qquad (30)$$

Lemma 4.38 $\alpha \prec_t \beta \,\&\, t <_{lex} u \Rightarrow \alpha(u) = \beta(u)$.

Proof. This is seen from Lemma 4.36.2. □

Lemma 4.39 *Suppose that* $u = t \vee u <_{lex} t \vee t <_{lex} u$.

1. *Suppose* $\delta \lhd_u \gamma \lhd_t \beta$. *Then* $\delta \lhd_s \beta$ *for* $s = \max_{<_{lex}}\{u, t\}$.

2. *Suppose that* $\delta \lhd_u^+ \gamma \lhd_t^+ \beta$. *Then* $\delta \lhd_s^+ \beta$ *for* $s = \max_{<_{lex}}\{u, t\}$.

Proof.
4.39.1. This is seen from Lemma 4.38.
4.39.2. By Lemma 4.39.1 we have $\delta \lhd_s \beta$.

If either $u = t$ or $t <_{lex} u$, then $\delta \lhd_u^+ \beta$ is seen from the definition.

In what follows assume $u <_{lex} t$.

Let j denote the number such that $u|j = t|j \,\&\, u(j) = 0 < 1 = t(j)$. Suppose $t(i) = 1 \,\&\, i \not\in In(\delta(t|i))$. We have to show that there are sequences enjoying the condition (30).

If $i < j$, then $\delta \lhd_u^+ \gamma$ yields the assertion. If $i > j$, then $\delta(t|i) = \gamma(t|i)$ by Lemma 4.38, and hence $\gamma \lhd_t^+ \beta$ yields the assertion. Finally assume $i = j$. We have $(\delta(u|i))_i^0 = (\gamma(u|i))_i^0$. If $i \not\in In(\gamma(t|i))$, then pick sequences $\{\alpha_k\}_{k\leq K}$ and $\{v_k\}_{k<K}$ for $\gamma(t|i) = \alpha_K$ and i. Otherwise set $K = 0$. Now let $\alpha_{K+1} = \delta(t|i)$ and $(t|i) * v_K = u$. Sequences $\{\alpha_k\}_{k\leq K+1}$ and $\{v_k\}_{k<K+1}$ are desired one for δ, t and i. □

Lemma 4.40 1. *Let* s *be unitary with* $s \subseteq s[\alpha, \beta]$. *Assume* $[\ell(s) > d(s) \Rightarrow \alpha \prec_{s|(\ell(s)-1)} \beta]$ *and* $\alpha(s) \prec_{\ell(s)}^p \gamma' \prec_{\ell(s)} \beta(s)$. *Then there exists a* γ *such that* $\gamma(s) = \gamma'$, $\alpha \prec_s \gamma$, $[\ell(s) > d(s) \Rightarrow \gamma \prec_{s|(\ell(s)-1)} \beta]$ *and*

$$\forall j \in [d(s), \ell(s))\{s(j) = 1 \leftrightarrow j \in In(\gamma(s|j))\} \qquad (31)$$

2. *Assume* $\alpha \prec_s \beta \,\&\, \alpha(s) \prec_{\ell(s)}^p \gamma' \prec_{\ell(s)}^p \beta(s)$. *Then there exists a* γ *such that* $\gamma(s) = \gamma'$ *and* $\alpha \prec_s \gamma \prec_s \beta$.

3. *Assume* $[\ell(s) > d(s) \Rightarrow \alpha \prec_{s|(\ell(s)-1)} \beta]$ *and* $\alpha(s) \prec_{\ell(s)}^p \gamma' \lhd_{\ell(s)} \beta(s)$. *Then there exists a* γ *such that* $\gamma(s) = \gamma'$, $\alpha \prec_s \gamma$ *and* $\gamma \lhd_s \beta$.

Proof.
4.40.1 by induction on $\ell\alpha$. Suppose s is unitary. If s is null, then $\gamma = \gamma'$ works.

Suppose s is not null, and put $i = \ell(s) - 1$. By IH we can assume that $\gamma' = ppd_{i+1}(\alpha(s))$. Then $\forall j \in [d(s), i)\forall\delta\{\alpha \preceq_j \delta \prec_j \beta \Rightarrow j \not\in In(\delta)\}$ and

$\alpha \prec^p_i \beta$ with $\exists\delta\{\alpha \preceq_i \delta \prec_i \beta \,\&\, i \in In(\delta)\}$, i.e., $rg_i(\alpha^0_i) \preceq_i \beta \leq \alpha^0_j$ for any $j \in [d(s), i)$. Therefore the condition (28) in Definition 4.34.1 holds. Hence

$$\alpha(s) = \min\{\delta : \alpha^0_i \preceq^p_{i+1} \delta < \alpha'(s)\},$$

where

$$\alpha' = \min(\{\alpha^0_j : j \in [d(s), i)\} \cup \{\alpha^1_i\}).$$

If $\alpha'(s) = \alpha_\pi$, then we would have $\gamma' = ppd_{i+1}(\alpha(s)) = \alpha_\pi \not\prec_{i+1} \beta(s)$. Hence $\alpha'(s) < \alpha_\pi$, and $\alpha' = \alpha^1_i$. This means that

$$\alpha \prec_{s|i} \alpha' \tag{32}$$

We have $\alpha^0_i \prec_{i+1} \alpha^1_i = \alpha' \preceq_{i+1} \alpha'(s)$ by Lemma 4.22, and hence either $ppd_{i+1}(\alpha(s)) = \alpha'(s)$ or $\alpha(s) \lhd_{i+1} \alpha'(s)$ by Lemma 4.29.2. If $\gamma' = ppd_{i+1}(\alpha(s)) = \alpha'(s)$, then $\gamma = \alpha'$ works: If $\beta \leq \alpha'$, then we would have by (32) and Lemma 4.38, $\beta(s) \in \{(\alpha^m_i(s) : m \leq 1\} \leq \alpha'(s) = \gamma'$. Hence $\alpha' < \beta$, which yields $\gamma = \alpha^0_i \prec_{s|(\ell(s)-1)} \beta$. On the other hand we have, for (31), $i \in In(\alpha^1_i)$. Otherwise we would have $\beta > \alpha^1_i = \alpha_\pi$.

Suppose $\alpha(s) \lhd_{i+1} \alpha'(s)$. We have $\alpha^0_i \prec^p_i rg_{i+1}(\alpha(s)) = ppd_{i+1}(\alpha(s)) = \gamma'$ by Lemma 4.29.1. Let $\delta = \max\{\delta : \alpha^1_i \preceq_{s|i} \delta \,\&\, \alpha(s) \lhd_{i+1} \delta(s)\}$. Then $rg_{i+1}(\delta(s)) \preceq_{i+1} rg_{i+1}(\alpha(s)) = \gamma' < \beta(s) \leq \alpha_\pi$ by Lemma 4.18.9, and hence $\delta = \alpha^k_i$ for a k by the maximality of δ and $\delta \preceq_{s|i} \delta^0_i$.

We have $\delta' = \min(\{\delta^0_j : j \in [d(s), i)\} \cup \{\alpha^{k+1}_i\}) = \alpha^{k+1}_i$ and $\delta(s) = \min\{\eta : \alpha^k_i \preceq^p_{i+1} \eta < (\alpha^{k+1}_i)(s)\}$. Therefore

$$\alpha \prec_{s|i} \alpha^1_i \prec_{s|i} \alpha^{k+1}_i \tag{33}$$

We have either $(\alpha^k_i)(s) \lhd_{i+1} (\alpha^{k+1}_i)(s)$ or $ppd_{i+1}((\alpha^k_i)(s)) = (\alpha^{k+1}_i)(s)$. By the maximality of δ, we have $ppd_{i+1}((\alpha^k_i)(s)) = (\alpha^{k+1}_i)(s)$, and $\gamma' = rg_{i+1}(\alpha(s)) = (\alpha^{k+1}_i)(s)$. Thus $\gamma = \alpha^{k+1}_i$ works: Suppose $\beta \leq \alpha^{k+1}_i$. Then by (33) and Lemma 4.38 we would have $\beta(s) \in \{(\alpha^m_i)(s) : m \leq k+1\} \leq (\alpha^{k+1}_i)(s) = \gamma'$. Hence $\alpha^{k+1}_i < \beta$, which yields $\gamma = \alpha^{k+1}_i \prec_{s|(\ell(s)-1)} \beta$. On the other hand we have, for (31), $i \in In(\alpha^{k+1}_i)$. Otherwise we would have $\beta > \alpha^{k+1}_i = \alpha_\pi$.
4.40.2 by induction on $\ell(s)$. The unitary case follows from Lemma 4.40.1.

Next let $s = s_0 * \cdots * s_{k-1} * s_k$ be the unitary decomposition of s, and $t = s_0 * \cdots * s_{k-1}$. Then $\alpha \prec_s \beta \Leftrightarrow \alpha \prec_t \beta \,\&\, \alpha(t) \prec_{s_k} \beta(t)$. Then $\alpha(s) = (\alpha(t))(s_k)$ and similarly for $\beta(s)$. By the unitary case pick a δ such that $\alpha(t) \prec_{s_k} \delta \prec_{s_k} \beta(t) \,\&\, \delta(s_k) = \gamma'$. By IH pick a γ such that $\alpha \prec_t \gamma \prec_t \beta \,\&\, \gamma(t) = \delta$.
4.40.3. The unitary case follows again from Lemma 4.40.1.

Next let $s = s_0 * \cdots * s_{k-1} * s_k$ be the unitary decomposition of s, and $t = s_0 * \cdots * s_{k-1}$. Then $t \subseteq_e s|(\ell(s)-1)$, and, by Lemma 4.40.2, it suffices to find a δ such that $\alpha(t) \prec_{s_k} \delta \lhd_{s_k} \beta(t)$ and $\delta(s_k) = \gamma'$. This is seen from Lemma 4.40.1. □

Lemma 4.41 *Assume $\alpha \prec \beta$ and $\alpha \not\prec_s \beta$ for an $s \subseteq_e s[2; \alpha, \beta]$. Then there exist a γ and a t such that $t \subseteq_e s$ and $\alpha \preceq_t \gamma \lhd^+_t \beta$.*

Moreover let γ denote the minimal diagram for which the above conditions hold for some t. Then there are no δ and no u such that $u <_{lex} t$ and $\alpha \preceq_t \delta \lhd^+_u \gamma$.

Proof. We can assume that $\ell(s) > 2 \Rightarrow \alpha \prec_{s^-} \beta$ for $s^- = s|i$ with $i = \ell(s) - 1$, and $\alpha(s) \not\prec^p_{\ell(s)} \beta(s)$. We show $t = s$ works for a γ.

First consider the case when $\ell(s) = 2$, i.e., s is empty. Then $\alpha \prec \beta$ while $\alpha \not\prec^p_2 \beta$. This means that $\alpha \preceq^p_2 \gamma \lhd_2 \beta$ for a γ. In what follows assume $\ell(s) > 2$.

Second consider the case when $s(i) = 0$. Then $\alpha(s) = \alpha(s^-) \prec^p_i \beta(s)$ while $\alpha(s) \not\prec^p_{i+1} \beta(s)$. On the other side $s(i) = 0$ yields $\alpha(s) \prec_{i+1} \beta(s)$. Hence by Lemma 4.29.2 there exists a γ' such that $\alpha(s) \preceq^p_{i+1} \gamma' \lhd_{i+1} \beta(s)$. By Lemma 4.40.3 pick a γ so that $\gamma(s) = \gamma'$ and $\alpha \preceq_s \gamma \lhd^+_s \beta$.

Third consider the case when $s(i) = 1$. Let $s = s_0 * \cdots s_{k-1} * v = u * v$ be the unitary decomposition of s. Then $\alpha(u) = \alpha(s^-) \prec^p_i \beta(u)$ while $\alpha(s) \not\prec^p_{i+1} \beta(s)$. From $\alpha \prec_{s^-} \beta$ and $s(i) = 1$, we see that $(\alpha(u))^0_i < \beta(u)$ and $\alpha(s) = \min\{\delta : (\alpha(u))^0_i \preceq^p_{i+1} \delta < (\alpha(u))^1_i)(v)\}$.

If $\beta(s) = \alpha_\pi$, then we would have $\alpha(s) \prec^p_{i+1} \beta(s)$. Hence $\beta(s) < \alpha_\pi$.

We have $(\alpha(u))^0_i \prec_{i+1} (\alpha(u))^1_i \preceq_{i+1} (\beta(u))^0_i \preceq^p_{i+1} \beta(s)$. Therefore $\alpha(s) \prec_{i+1}$. Hence by Lemma 4.29.2 there exists a γ' such that $\alpha(s) \preceq^p_{i+1} \gamma' \lhd_{i+1} \beta(s)$. By Lemma 4.40.3 pick a γ so that $\gamma(s) = \gamma'$ and $\alpha \preceq_s \gamma \lhd^+_s \beta$.

Lemma 4.39 with the minimality of γ yields the last assertion of the lemma. □

Lemma 4.42 *Assume* $\alpha \prec_s \gamma$ *and* $\alpha \preceq_u \eta \lhd_u \delta \lhd_t \gamma$ *for a* $u \subseteq_e s \cap t$. *Then* $\#u < \#t$ *if* $t <_{lex} s \vee t \subseteq_e s$.

Proof. If $u = t \subseteq_e s$, then $\alpha(t) \preceq_{\ell(t)} \eta(t) \lhd_{\ell(t)} \delta(t) \lhd_{\ell(t)} \gamma(t)$, and hence $\alpha(t) \not\prec_{\ell(t)} \gamma(t)$. This is not the case.

Assume $u \subset_e t \,\&\, u \subset_e s \,\&\, \#u = \#t$. Then $t = u * v$ for a non empty null v. We have $\alpha \preceq_u \eta \lhd_u \delta \prec_u \gamma$ and $\alpha \prec_u \gamma$. Hence

$$\eta(u) \prec_{\ell(u)} \delta(u) \prec_{\ell(u)} rg_{\ell(u)}(\eta(u)) \preceq_{\ell(u)} \gamma(u).$$

Therefore $\exists \xi[\delta(u) \preceq_{\ell(u)} \xi \prec_{\ell(u)} \gamma(u) \,\&\, \ell(u) \in In(\xi)]$ by Lemma 4.16.6. This contradicts $t(\ell(u)) = 0$ and $t \subseteq s[\delta, \gamma]$. □

Lemma 4.43 *Let* $\alpha \lhd^+_s \beta$.

1. *Assume* $s(i) = 1$ *and* $i \notin In(\alpha(s|i))$ *for an* $i \in [d(s), \ell(s))$. *Then there exist a sequence* $\{\alpha_k\}_{k \leq K}$ $(K > 0)$ *of diagrams and a sequence* $\{v_k\}_{k<K} \subseteq I$ *enjoying (30) and the following condition (Cf. Definition 4.37.4.).*

$$\textit{Each } v_k \textit{ is null, and } \forall k < K - 1\{v_k \subset_e v_{k+1}\}.$$

2. *Assume* $\#u \geq \#s$ *and* $u <_{lex} s$. *Then* $\alpha(u) = \alpha_\pi$ *and* $\neg\exists\gamma[\gamma \lhd_u \alpha]$.

Proof.
4.43.1. By the Definition 4.37.4 let $K > 0$ denote the *least* number for which there exist sequences $\{\alpha_k\}_{k \leq K}$ and $\{v_k\}_{k<K}$ enjoying (30).

Note that $v_k(i) = 0$ since $v_k \subseteq s[\alpha_{k+1}, \alpha_k]$ and $s[d(v_k); \alpha_{k+1}, \alpha_k](i) = 0$ by $(\alpha_{k+1})^0_i = \alpha_0$.

Claim 4.44 *1. Each v_k is null.*

2. $\forall k \in (0, K)\{v_{k-1} \subset_e v_k\}$.

Proof of Claim 4.44 by simultaneous induction on k.

Supposing that v_k is not null, let $m_k = \min\{m \geq i : v_k(m_k) = 1\}$. $m_k > i$ by $v_k(i) = 0$.

Now $m_0 > i \in In(\alpha_0)$ yields $\alpha_0(v_0|(m_0+1)) = (\alpha_0)_\pi = \alpha_0(v_0) \not\prec rg_{\ell(v_0)}(\alpha_1(v_0))$. This is not the case, and v_0 is null.

Suppose v_{k-1} is null, while v_k is not null. Then $v_{k-1} \subset_e v_k$ and $m_k \geq \ell(v_{k-1})$. Since v_{k-1} is null, $\alpha_k(v_{k-1}) = \alpha_k$.

Hence $m_k > \ell(v_{k-1}) \in In(\alpha_k)$ yields $\alpha_k(v_k|(m_k+1)) = (\alpha_k)_\pi = \alpha_k(v_k) \not\prec rg_{\ell(v_k)}(\alpha_{k+1}(v_k))$. This is not the case.

Suppose $m_k = \ell(v_{k-1})$, and let $\ell(v_{k-2}) = i$ if $k = 1$. Then by IH we have $In(\alpha_{k-1}) \ni \ell(v_{k-2}) < \ell(v_{k-1}) = m_k$, and $(\alpha_k)^0_{\ell(v_{k-2})} = \alpha_{k-1} = \alpha_{k-1}(v_{k-1}) \prec rg_{\ell(v_{k-1})}(\alpha_k(v_{k-1})) = rg_{m_k}(\alpha_k)$. Therefore $\alpha_k(v_k|(m_k+1)) = (\alpha_k)_\pi$. Again this is not the case. We have shown Claim 4.44.1.

Suppose both v_{k-1} and v_k are null, and $v_{k-1} \not\subset_e v_k$. Then we shown that sequences can be shortened contradicting the minimality of the number K.

Suppose either $v_{k-1} <_{lex} v_k$ or $v_k <_{lex} v_{k-1}$. Then $\alpha_{k+1} \lhd_v \alpha_{k-1}$ for $v = \max_{<_{lex}}\{v_{k-1}, v_k\}$ by Lemma 4.39.1.

Suppose $v_k \subset_e v_{k-1}$. Then $\alpha_k = \alpha_k(v_k) \prec_{\ell(v_k)} rg_{\ell(v_k)}(\alpha_{k+1}(v_k)) = rg_{\ell(v_k)}(\alpha_{k+1})$ and $v_{k-1}(\ell(v_k)) = 0$. The latter means that there is no δ such that $\alpha_k \preceq_{\ell(v_k)} \delta \prec_{\ell(v_k)} \alpha_{k-1}$. Therefore from Lemma 4.16.6 we see $\alpha_{k+1} \lhd_{v_k} \alpha_{k-1}$.

4.43.2. Let i denote the number such that $u(i) = 0 < 1 = s(i) \,\&\, u|i = s|i$. By $\#u \geq \#s$, let $j = \min\{j > i : u(j) = 1\}$. We show $\alpha(u|(j+1)) = \alpha_\pi$. Then $\alpha(u) = \alpha(u|(j+1)) = \alpha_\pi$ follows.

Suppose $i \in In(\alpha(s|i))$. Then the condition (28) in Definition 4.34 is broken. Specifically $\alpha(u|i) = (\alpha(u|i))^0_i \leq (\alpha(u|i))^0_j$, and hence $\alpha(u|(j+1)) = \alpha_\pi$.

In what follows assume $i \notin In(\alpha(s|i))$, and let $\{\alpha_k\}_{k \leq K}$ and $\{v_k\}_{k<K}$ denote sequences in Lemma 4.43.1 for i.

$j > \ell(v_{K-1})$ Let $\ell_k = \ell(v_k)$ for $k \in [0, K)$ and $\ell_{-1} = i$. Then we have $\ell_k > \ell_{k-1}$ for any $k \in [0, K)$.

First consider the case when $j = \ell_k$ for a $k \in [0, K)$. Then $\ell_k > \ell_{k-1} \in In(\alpha_k)$ and $(\alpha_{k+1})^0_{\ell_{k-1}} = \alpha_k \prec rg_{\ell_k}(\alpha_{k+1})$. Hence $\alpha(u|(\ell_k+1)) = \alpha_\pi$.

Otherwise there exists a maximal $k \in [-1, K)$ such that $\ell_k < j$. Then $(\alpha_K)^0_{\ell_k} = \alpha_{k+1} \leq (\alpha_K)^0_j$, and hence $\alpha(u|(j+1)) = \alpha_\pi$. We are done. □

5 Wellfoundedness proof for $Od(\Pi_N)$ by means of inductive definitions

In this section we work in the theory Π_{N-1}-Fix and show the

Theorem 5.1 *For each $\alpha < d_\Omega \varepsilon_{\pi+1}$,i.e., each $\alpha \in Od(\Pi_N)|\Omega$, Π^0_{N-1}-Fix proves that $(Od(\Pi_N)|\alpha, <)$ is a well ordering.*

5.1 Operators $\mathcal{G}_i$

Define operators $\mathcal{G}_i$ $(1 \leq i < N-1)$ on $Od(\Pi_N)$ recursively from the operator $\mathcal{G}(X)$ in Definition 3.8.

Definition 5.2 Define inductively Π^0_i-operators $\mathcal{G}_i$ $(1 \leq i < N-1)$ as follows.

1.

$$\mathcal{G}_1(X) := \mathcal{G}(X).$$

2. For $1 < i \leq N-1$

$$\mathcal{G}_{<i}(X) := \bigcap\{\mathcal{G}_j(X) : 1 \leq j < i\}.$$

3. For $s \in I(2)$

$$\alpha \in \mathcal{G}_s(X) :\Leftrightarrow \forall \gamma \lhd^+_s \alpha[\gamma \in \mathcal{G}_{<2+\#s}(X) \to \gamma \leq X|\alpha].$$

4. For $2 \leq i < N-1$

$$\mathcal{G}_i := \bigcap\{\mathcal{G}_s(X) : s \in I(2) \,\&\, 2+\#s = i\}.$$

Now let us define an operator Γ_N on $Od(\Pi_N)$ from these operators.

Definition 5.3

$$\begin{aligned}
&\alpha \in \Gamma_N(X) :\Leftrightarrow \alpha < \pi \,\&\, \alpha \in \mathcal{G}_{<N-1}(X) \,\&\\
&[\alpha \in SR \to \forall \gamma \in \mathcal{D}_\alpha(\gamma \in \mathcal{G}(X) \to \gamma \in X)] \,\&\\
&\forall \gamma \in \mathcal{G}_{<N-1}(X)[\gamma \prec_{s[2;\gamma,\alpha]} \alpha \Rightarrow \gamma \leq X|\alpha]
\end{aligned}$$

Let us examine the complexity of these operators. By induction on i we see that $\mathcal{G}_i$ is a Π^0_i-operator, and hence Γ_N is Π^0_{N-1}. In this subsection we work in Π^0_{N-1}-Fix, and write Γ for Γ_N, $|\alpha|$ for $|\alpha|_{\Gamma_N}$, resp.

We see easily that $\Gamma = \Gamma_N$ enjoys the hypotheses **(Γ.0)**, **(Γ.1)** and **(Γ.5)** in Subsection 3.3. Furthermore **(Γ.3)** and **(Γ.4)** follow from the facts: if $\alpha \notin R'$ or $\alpha \in SR$, then $\alpha \in \mathcal{G}_{<N-1}(X)$ for any X.

Lemma 5.4 *All of $\mathcal{G}_i$ and $\Gamma = \Gamma_N$ are persistent and enjoys $\mathcal{W} \subseteq \Gamma(\mathcal{W})$.*

Proof. By Lemma 3.9 $\mathcal{G}_1 = \mathcal{G}$ is persistent. Hence by induction on i we see, from Lemma 2.2.1, all of $\mathcal{G}_i$ are persitent, too. Therefore so is Γ. $\mathcal{W} \subseteq \Gamma(\mathcal{W})$ follows from Lemma 3.26. □

5.2 Adequacy of the operator Γ

We next show that Γ enjoys the hypothesis **(Γ.2)**. First we show the following lemmata.

Lemma 5.5 *Assume* $\alpha, \delta \in \mathcal{G}_1(X)$. *Then* $\alpha < \delta \,\&\, \alpha \not\prec \delta \Rightarrow \alpha \leq X|\delta$.

Proof. Let η denote the diagram such that $\alpha \preceq \eta \,\&\, \eta < \delta < pd_2(\eta)$. We have $\alpha \leq \eta \in \mathcal{C}^{\delta}(X)|\delta \subseteq X|\delta$ by Lemma 3.10.3 and $\delta \in \mathcal{G}_1(X)$. □

Lemma 5.6 *Let* $2 \leq i < N-1$ *and* $X = \Gamma^x$ *for an ordinal* x. *Then*

$$\alpha \prec \beta \,\&\, \alpha \in \mathcal{G}_{<i}(X), \beta \in \mathcal{G}_{<i+1}(X) \Rightarrow \alpha \leq X|\beta \lor \alpha \prec_{s_0} \beta,$$

where s_0 *denotes the longest initial segment of* $s[2;\alpha,\beta]$ *such that* $\#s_0 \leq i-2$.

Proof by induction on i. Suppose $\alpha \not\prec_{s_0} \beta$. By Lemma 4.41 pick a *minimal* γ and an s such that $s \subseteq_e s_0$, and

$$\alpha \preceq_s \gamma \lhd_s^+ \beta \,\&\, 2 + \#s \leq i.$$

We show

$$\gamma \in \mathcal{G}_{<2+\#s}(X).$$

Then by $\beta \in \mathcal{G}_{<i+1}(X) \subseteq \mathcal{G}_s(X)$ we conclude $\alpha \leq \gamma \leq X|\beta$.

Assume $\alpha \not\leq X|\beta$. By Lemma 3.16 we have for any δ

$$\alpha \preceq \delta \Rightarrow \delta \in \mathcal{G}_1(X).$$

Thus $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}_1(X)$.

Let $t \in I$ denote an initial sequence such that $\#t < \#s$, and suppose $\mathcal{G}_{<2+\#t}(X) \ni \delta \lhd_t^+ \gamma$. Then $t \subseteq_e s[2;\delta,\gamma]$ by the definition, and $\#t < \#s \leq \#s_0 \leq i-2$. We have to show $\delta \leq X|\gamma$.

Put

$$\alpha_0 = \min\{\alpha, \delta\},\ \alpha_1 = \max\{\alpha, \delta\} \text{ and } v = s[2;\alpha_0,\alpha_1].$$

It suffices to show $\alpha_0 \leq X|\gamma \subseteq X|\beta$.

First consider the case when $\alpha_0 \not\preceq \alpha_1$. By Lemma 5.5 we have $\alpha_0 \leq X|\alpha_1 \subseteq X|\gamma$.

In what follows assume $\alpha_0 \preceq \alpha_1$.

Second consider the case when $s <_{lex} t$. Then by Lemma 4.39.2 we have $\delta \lhd_t^+ \beta$. $\beta \in \mathcal{G}_{<i+1}(X) \subseteq \mathcal{G}_{2+\#t}(X)$ yields $\delta \leq X|\beta$. By the assumption $\alpha \not\leq X|\beta$ this means that $\delta \leq X|\alpha \subseteq X|\gamma$.

In what follows suppose $s \not<_{lex} t$. Then we have either $t \subset_e s$ or $t <_{lex} s$ by $\#t < \#s$. Let $w = s \cap t$ and $i = \ell(w)$. Then $s|i = t|i$ and $t <_{lex} s \Rightarrow t(i) = 0 < 1 = s(i)$.

We show the following claim. Claim 5.7.4 yields the lemma by $X|\alpha_1 \subseteq X|\gamma$.

Claim 5.7 *1.* $t <_{lex} s \Rightarrow \delta(w) \not\preceq_i \alpha(w)$. *Therefore* $\alpha \neq \delta$.

2. $w \subseteq_e v$.

3. $\alpha_0 \not\prec_w \alpha_1$.

4. $\alpha_0 \leq X|\alpha_1$.

Proof of Claim 5.7.
5.7.1. Assume $t <_{lex} s$ and $\delta(w) \preceq_i \alpha(w)$. Then by $t|(i+1) \subseteq_e t \subseteq_e s[2;\delta,\gamma]$ and $t(i) = 0$, $\nexists\eta\{\delta(w) \preceq_i \eta \prec_i \gamma(w)\}$ with $w = t|i = s|i$. On the other hand we have $\exists\eta\{\alpha(w) \preceq_i \eta \prec_i \gamma(w)\}$ by $\alpha \prec_s \gamma$ and $s(i) = 1$. A contradiction.

Assume $\alpha = \delta$. Then $\delta(w) = \alpha(w)$ and hence $t \not<_{lex} s$, i.e., $t \subset_e s$. But then we have $\alpha \prec_t \gamma \,\&\, \alpha \lhd_t \gamma$. This is not the case.
5.7.2. Suppose $w \not\subseteq_e v$. We have $w \subseteq_e s[2;\alpha_0,\gamma]$ and $\alpha_1 \prec_{w|(\ell(w)-1)} \gamma$. Thus by Lemma 4.36.4 we have $v <_{lex} w$. But then $\alpha(w) = \delta(w)$, and hence $t \not<_{lex} s$ by Claim 5.7.1. Hence we have $w = t = s|i \subset_e s$, and this would yield $\alpha(s|i) \lhd_i \gamma(s|i)$ contradicting $\alpha \preceq_s \gamma$.
5.7.3. Suppose $\alpha_0 \prec_w \alpha_1$.

First consider the case when $\alpha_1 = \alpha$. Then $\delta \prec_w \alpha \prec_w \gamma$ and hence $\delta \prec_w \gamma$. If $t \subset_e s$, then this means that $\delta \prec_t \gamma$, contradicting $\delta \lhd_t \gamma$. $t \not<_{lex} s$ is not the case by Claim 5.7.1.

Next consider the case when $\alpha_1 = \delta$. Then $\alpha \prec_w \delta \,\&\, \alpha \prec_w \gamma$ and hence $\delta \prec_w \gamma$. $t \subset_e s$ is not the case since this contradicts $\delta \lhd_t \gamma$. Assume $t <_{lex} s$. Then $\alpha(u) \prec_j \gamma(u) = \delta(u)$ for any u with $w \subset_e u \subseteq_e s$, and $j = \ell(u)$. Therefore $\alpha \prec_s \delta \lhd_s^+ \beta$ by Lemma 4.39.2. This contradicts the minimality of γ.
5.7.4. Let $j - 2 := \#w \leq \#t < \#s \leq i - 2$.

First consider the case when $\alpha_1 = \alpha$. Then we have $\alpha_1 = \alpha \in \mathcal{G}_{<i}(X) \subseteq \mathcal{G}_{<j+1}(X)$ and $\alpha_0 = \delta \in \mathcal{G}_{<2+\#t}(X) \subseteq \mathcal{G}_{<j}(X)$. Thus IH with Claims 5.7.2 and 5.7.3 yields $\alpha_0 \leq X|\alpha_1$.

Assume $\alpha_1 = \delta$. We have $\alpha_0 = \alpha \in \mathcal{G}_{<i}(X) \subseteq \mathcal{G}_{<j}(X)$. On the other hand we have $\delta \in \mathcal{G}_{<2+\#t}(X) \subseteq \mathcal{G}_{<j}(X)$. Therefore we can assume $\#w = \#t$.

Again IH with Claims 5.7.2 and 5.7.3 yields either $\alpha \leq X|\delta$ or $\alpha \prec_{w_0} \delta$ for the longest initial segment of $s[2;\alpha,\delta]$ such that $\#w_0 \leq j - 3 = \#w - 1$. Now pick a $u \subseteq_e w$ and an η so that $\alpha \preceq_u \eta \lhd_u \delta$ by Lemma 4.41. Then we have $\#u < \#t = \#w$ by Lemma 4.42. Hence $u \subseteq_e w_0$, and $\alpha \not\prec_{w_0} \delta$. Thus $\alpha \leq X|\delta$. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 4.7 for $\Gamma = \Gamma_N$. Assume $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{W}$ and $\alpha < \beta$. Put $x = |\alpha|, y = |\beta|$. We show $x < y$ by induction on the natural sum $x\#y$. Suppose $x \geq y$. Put $X = \Gamma^x, Y = \Gamma^y$. We show $\alpha \leq Y$. As in [8] we see, using IH, $\alpha \in \mathcal{G}_1(X)|\beta = \mathcal{G}_1(Y)|\beta \,\&\, \alpha \in \mathcal{G}_{<N-1}(Y)$, and we can assume $\alpha \prec \beta \in \mathcal{D}^Q$ by IH.

Then Lemma 5.6 with $i = N - 2$ yields either $\alpha \leq Y|\beta$ or $\alpha \prec_s \beta$ for $s = s[2;\alpha,\beta]$ since $\#s \leq N - 4 = i - 2$. Assume $\alpha \prec_s \beta$. Then $\mathcal{G}_{<N-1}(Y) \ni \alpha \prec_s \beta \in \Gamma_N(Y)$. Consequently $\alpha \leq Y|\beta$ by Definition 5.3.

This completes a proof of Theorem 4.7 for $\Gamma = \Gamma_N$. $\square$

5.3 Proof of Lemma 4.11

In this subsection we prove Lemma 4.11 for $Od(\Pi_N)$ and Γ.

Definition 5.8 $\mathcal{G}_i := \mathcal{G}_i(\mathcal{W})$ and $\mathcal{G}_{<1+i} := \mathcal{G}_{<1+i}(\mathcal{W})$ for $1 \leq i < N-1$.

Lemma 5.9 *For any* $i \leq N-1$, *if* $\mathcal{G}_1 \ni \alpha \preceq \rho \in \mathcal{D}^Q$ *and* $\tau := rg_i(\rho)\downarrow$, *then* $st_i(\rho) \in \mathcal{C}^{\tau}(\mathcal{W})$.

In particular, $\mathcal{G}_1 \ni \alpha \preceq \rho \in \mathcal{D}^Q \Rightarrow st_{N-1}(\rho) \in \mathcal{C}^{\pi}(\mathcal{W}) = \mathcal{W}_{\pi}$ *for* $\pi = rg_{N-1}(\rho)$.

Proof. Assume $\mathcal{G}_1 \ni \alpha \preceq \rho \in \mathcal{D}^Q_{\sigma}$ and put $\nu = st_i(\rho)$. Then $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}^{\alpha}(\mathcal{W})$, and hence $\nu \in \mathcal{C}^{\alpha}(\mathcal{W})$. On the other hand we have $\forall \kappa \leq \tau[K_{\kappa}\nu < \alpha]$ by the condition (27), ($\mathcal{D}$.2) in Definition 4.14 and Lemma 2.2.3. Lemma 3.6 with $\mathcal{C}^{\alpha}(\mathcal{W})|\alpha \subseteq \mathcal{W}$ yields $\nu \in \mathcal{C}^{\tau}(\mathcal{W})$. □

Definition 5.10 *1.* $\overline{\alpha}$ denotes the sequence of ordinal diagrams $\{\alpha(s) : s \in I(2, N-2)\}$ ordered by the opposite relation of $<_{lex}$ on I:

$$\overline{\alpha} := \langle \alpha(s) : s \in I(2, N-2) \rangle = \langle \cdots, \alpha(s_n), \alpha(s_{n+1}), \cdots \rangle \text{ where } s_{n+1} <_{lex} s_n.$$

2. $\gamma \prec^{pl}_{N-1} \alpha$ denotes the lexicographic ordering on the finite sequences $\overline{\gamma}$ of diagrams with respect to the ordering $\prec^{p}_{N-2}$: $\gamma \prec^{pl}_{N-1} \alpha$ iff

$$\exists s \in I(2, N-2)[\forall t \in I(2, N-2)\{s <_{lex} t \Rightarrow \gamma(t) = \alpha(t)\} \,\&\, \gamma(s) \prec^{p}_{N-2} \alpha(s)].$$

Lemma 5.11 *For each* $\alpha \in Od(\Pi_N)|\pi$,

$$\alpha \in \mathcal{G}_{<N-1} \Rightarrow \alpha \in \mathcal{W}.$$

Specifically, for each $n \in \omega$,

$$\forall \alpha \in \mathcal{D}^Q \forall \alpha_{\pi}[\alpha \preceq \alpha_{\pi} \in \mathcal{D}_{\pi} \,\&\, b(\alpha_{\pi}) < \omega_n(\pi+1) \,\&\, \alpha \in \mathcal{G}_{<N-1} \Rightarrow \alpha \in \mathcal{W}].$$

Proof. Assume $b(\alpha_{\pi}) < \omega_n(\pi+1)$ for $\alpha \preceq \alpha_{\pi} \in \mathcal{D}_{\pi}$. Then Lemma 4.31 yields $st_{N-1}(\alpha) \leq st_{N-1}(\alpha^0_{N-2}) \leq b(\alpha_{\pi}) < \omega_n(\pi+1)$.

Assume $\alpha \in \mathcal{G}_{<N-1}$. Then for any $t \in I(2, N-2)$, $st_{N-1}(\alpha(t)), st_{N-1}(\alpha(t)^0_{N-2}) \in \mathcal{W}_{\pi}|\omega_n(\pi+1)$ by Lemma 5.9. It suffices to show $\alpha \in \Gamma(\mathcal{W}) \subseteq \mathcal{W}$, i.e., by Definition 5.3, show that for any $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}_{<N-1}$ with $s = s[2;\gamma,\alpha]$, if $\gamma \prec_s \alpha$, then $\gamma \leq \mathcal{W}|\alpha$. By Lemma 4.32 we have $\overline{st}_{N-1}(\gamma(s)) <_{lex} \overline{st}_{N-1}(\alpha(s))$ for $\overline{st}_{N-1}(\alpha) = \langle st_{N-1}(\alpha^0_{N-2}), st_{N-1}(\alpha) \rangle$.

On the other hand we have $\forall t \in I(2, N-2)\{s <_{lex} t \Rightarrow \gamma(t) = \alpha(t)\}$, i.e., $\gamma \prec^{pl}_{N-1} \alpha$ by Lemma 4.38.

Thus the lemma is seen by induction along the lexicographic ordering $\prec^{pl}_{N-1}$. □

Proof of Lemma 4.11 for $Od(\Pi_N)$. We have to show for each $n \in \omega$

$$\forall \alpha \in \mathcal{W}_{\pi}|\omega_n(\pi+1) \forall q \subseteq \mathcal{W}_{\pi}|\omega_n(\pi+1) A(\alpha, q).$$

By main induction on $\alpha \in \mathcal{W}_\pi|\omega_n(\pi+1)$ with subsidiary induction on $q \subseteq \mathcal{W}_\pi|\omega_n(\pi+1)$. Here observe that if $\beta_1 \in \mathcal{D}$ with $b(\beta_1) < \omega_n(\pi+1)$, then by Lemma 4.19 we have $Q(\beta_1) \leq \max\{b(\beta_1), \pi\} < \omega_n(\pi+1)$.

Let $\alpha_1 \in \mathcal{D}_\sigma$ with $\sigma \in \mathcal{W}_\pi$ and $\alpha = b(\alpha_1) \,\&\, q = Q(\alpha_1)$. By Theorem 3.23 we have $\alpha_1 \in \mathcal{G}_1$. We show $\alpha_1 \in \mathcal{W}$. By Lemma 5.11 it suffices to show $\alpha_1 \in \mathcal{G}_{<N-1}$.

We show the following claim. Claim 5.12.2 with $K=1$ yields $\alpha_1 \in \mathcal{G}_{<N-1}$.

Claim 5.12 *Let $\eta \in \mathcal{G}_{<2+\#s}$ for an $s \in I(2)$.*

Assume that there exist sequences $\{\eta_k\}_{k\leq K}$ of diagrams and $\{s_k\}_{k<K} \subseteq I(2)\,(K \geq 1)$ such that $\eta_0 = \alpha_1$, $\eta_K = \eta$, $s_{K-1} = s$, $\forall k < K[\eta_{k+1} \lhd^+_{s_k} \eta_k]$ and $\forall k < K-1[s_k \subset_e s_{k+1} \,\&\, \#s_k \leq \#s_{k+1}]$.

Then the followings hold.

1. $\alpha_1 \prec rg_{\ell(s)}(\eta(s))\!\downarrow$ *and* $st_{\ell(s)}(\eta(s)) \in \mathcal{W}_\pi|\omega_n(\pi+1)$.

2. $\eta \in \mathcal{W}$.

Proof of Claim 5.12.1. Put $\nu = st_{\ell(s)}(\eta(s))$ and $\tau = rg_{\ell(s)}(\eta(s))$.

First we show $\alpha_1 \prec \tau$. We have $\eta_{k+1}(s_k) \lhd_{\ell(s_k)} \eta_k(s_k)$, and hence $rg_{\ell(s_k)}(\eta_k(s_k)) \preceq rg_{\ell(s_k)}(\eta_{k+1}(s_k))$. On the other hand we have $rg_{\ell(s_k)}(\eta_{k+1}(s_k)) \preceq rg_{\ell(s_{k+1})}(\eta_{k+1}(s_{k+1}))$ by $\ell(s_k) \in In(\eta_{k+1}(s_k)) \,\&\, s_k \subseteq_e s_{k+1}$ and Lemma 4.36.5. Hence we see $\alpha_1 = \eta_0 \prec rg_{\ell(s_0)}(\eta_1(s_0)) \preceq rg_{\ell(s_{K-1})}(\eta_K(s_{K-1})) = \tau$.

Next we show $\nu \in \mathcal{W}_\pi|\omega_n(\pi+1)$. By Lemma 4.18.6 and $i < N-1$ we have $\nu < \pi$.

Lemma 5.9 with $\eta \in \mathcal{G}_{<2+\#s} \subseteq \mathcal{G}_1$ yields

$$\nu \in \mathcal{C}^\tau(\mathcal{W}) \tag{34}$$

By Lemmata 4.18.6 and 2.4 with $\alpha_1 \prec \tau$ we have

$$\mathcal{B}_{>\tau}(\nu) < b(\alpha_1) = \alpha \tag{35}$$

Now Lemma 3.22 together with MIH(α), (34) and (35) yields $\nu \in \mathcal{C}^\pi(\mathcal{W}) = \mathcal{W}_\pi$. This shows Claim 5.12.1.

Proof of Claim 5.12.2.

For each $s \in I(2)$ let

$$E(s) := \sum\{3^{N-3-i}\cdot(1-s(i)) : 2 \leq i < \ell(s)\} + \sum\{3^{N-3-i}\cdot 2 : \ell(s) \leq i \leq N-3\}.$$

Observe that for $s, t \in I(2)$

$$s \subset_e t \vee s <_{lex} t \Rightarrow E(s) > E(t).$$

We show the Claim 5.12.2 by a triple induction: by main induction on $E(s)$ with subsidiary induction on the length $\ell(rg_{\ell(s)}(\eta(s)))$ of the diagram $rg_{\ell(s)}(\eta(s))$ with sub-subsidiary induction on $st_{\ell(s)}(\eta(s)) \in \mathcal{W}_\pi|\omega_n(\pi+1)$.

We have $b(\eta_\pi) = b((\alpha_1)_\pi) = \alpha < \omega_n(\pi + 1)$. By Lemma 5.11 it suffices to show $\eta \in \mathcal{G}_t$ for any $t \in I(2)$ with $\#t \geq \#s$.

Suppose $\mathcal{G}_{<2+\#t} \ni \delta \lhd^+_t \eta$. We show $\delta \in \mathcal{W}$.

We can assume $t \not<_{lex} s$ by Lemma 4.43.2. Then by $\#t \geq \#s$ we have one of the three cases $s \subset_e t$, $s <_{lex} t$ and $s = t$.

First consider the case when $s \subset_e t$. Extend the sequences $\{\eta_k\}, \{s_k\}$ by one, i.e., δ, t. MIH with $E(s) > E(t)$ yields $\delta \in \mathcal{W}$.

Second consider the case when $s_{K-1} = s <_{lex} t$. Since, in general, we have $u \subset_e s <_{lex} t \Rightarrow u \subset_e t \vee u <_{lex} t$, let $K' = \max(\{k < K - 1 : s_k \subset_e t\} \cup \{0\})$. Consider the sequences $\{\eta_k\}_{k \leq K'} \cup \{\delta\}$ and $\{s_k\}_{k<K'} \cup \{t\}$. Then we see $\delta \lhd^+_t \eta_{K'}$ from Lemma 4.39.2. Thus MIH with $E(s) > E(t)$ yields $\delta \in \mathcal{W}$.

Finally consider the case when $s = t$. Then $\delta \lhd^+_s \eta = \eta_K \lhd^+_s \eta_{K-1}$ yields $\delta \lhd^+_s \eta_{K-1}$ by Lemma 4.39.2. On the other hand we have $rg_{\ell(s)}(\eta(s)) \preceq rg_{\ell(s)}(\delta(s))$. If $rg_{\ell(s)}(\eta(s)) \prec rg_{\ell(s)}(\delta(s))$, then $\ell(rg_{\ell(s)}(\eta(s))) > \ell(rg_{\ell(s)}(\delta(s)))$. Otherwise we have $st_{\ell(s)}(\eta(s)) > st_{\ell(s)}(\delta(s))$ by Lemma 4.18.3. Considering the sequences $\{\eta_k\}_{k<K} \cup \{\delta\}$ and $\{s_k\}_{k<K}$, SIH or SSIH yields $\delta \in \mathcal{W}$.

This shows Claim 5.12.2, and completes a proof of Lemma 4.11 for $\mathcal{W}$. $\Box$

Lemma 4.11 yields Lemma 4.12: $\alpha_1 \in \mathcal{W}_\pi$ for each $\alpha_1 \in Od(\Pi_N)$ as in [8].

Consequently Lemma 3.18 yields Theorem 5.1.

6 Wellfoundedness proof by distinguished classes

In this section we work in the set theory $\mathrm{KP}\Pi_N$ for Π_N-reflecting universes and show the following theorem.

Theorem 6.1 *For each $\alpha \in Od(\Pi_N)|\Omega$, $\mathrm{KP}\Pi_N$ proves that $(Od(\Pi_N)|\alpha, <)$ is a well ordering.*

In [1] a system $(O(\Pi_N), <)$ was shown to be wellfounded. Our wellfoundedness proof in [1] is formalizable in the second order arithmetic $\Pi^1_1\text{-CA}_0 + \Sigma^{1-}_2\text{-CA}$, that is to say, we have assumed that the largest distinguished class $\mathcal{W}_D$ defined by a Σ^{1-}_2-formula exists as a set.

Our wellfoundedness proof is an extension of one for $O(\Pi_3)$ in [3], and is essntially the same as given in [4]. Lemmata stated without proofs are either easy or similarly seen as in [2] and [3].

$X, Y, \ldots$ range over *subsets* of $Od(\Pi_N)$. While $\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}, \ldots$ range over *classes*.

6.1 Distinguished classes

In this subsection distinguished classes are defined and elementary facts on these classes are established.

Definitions concerning the distinguished class are modified by requiring that, for any distinguished class $\mathcal{X}$, $\alpha \in \mathcal{X} \Rightarrow \alpha \in V^*(\mathcal{X})$ for a class $V^*(\mathcal{X})$ defined below.

Definition 6.2 *1.* For $2 \leq i < N-1$ define, cf. Lemma 4.18.3,

$$\alpha \lhd^s_i \beta :\Leftrightarrow \alpha \prec_i \beta \,\&\, \kappa = rg_i(\alpha)\!\downarrow = rg_i(\beta)\!\downarrow \,\&\, i \in In(\alpha).$$

2. $\alpha^- := \max\{\sigma \in R : \sigma \leq \alpha\}$.

3. For $2 \leq i \leq N-1$,

$$\beta \in U_i(X;\alpha) :\Leftrightarrow \beta \in \mathcal{D}^Q \Rightarrow \bigcup\{K_\sigma \nu : \nu = st_i(\beta), \sigma \leq rg_i(\beta)\} \subseteq X|\alpha^-.$$

4. For $2 \leq i < N-1$, $V^s_i(X;\delta)$ denotes the *wellfounded part* of the relation $\{(\alpha,\beta) : \alpha \in U_i(X;\delta) \,\&\, \alpha \lhd^s_i \beta\}$. Thus:

$$\alpha \in V^s_i(X;\delta) \Leftrightarrow \forall \beta \in U_i(X;\delta)[\beta \lhd^s_i \alpha \to \beta \in V^s_i(X;\delta)].$$

5. For $2 \leq i \leq N-1$, $U_{\geq i}(X;\delta) := \bigcap_{i \leq j \leq N-1} U_j(X;\delta)$.

6. For $2 \leq i < N-1$, $H^s_{\geq i}(X;\delta) := \bigcap_{i \leq j < N-1} H^s_j(X;\delta)$.

7. For $2 \leq i < N-1$,

$$\alpha \in H^s_i(X;\delta) :\Leftrightarrow \forall \beta \in U_i(X;\delta)[\beta \lhd^s_i \alpha \to \beta \in V^*_{i+1}(X;\delta) \cap V^s_i(X;\delta)].$$

8. For $2 \leq i \leq N-1$,

$$\alpha \in V^*_i(X;\delta) :\Leftrightarrow \forall \beta\{\alpha \preceq_i \beta < \pi \Rightarrow \beta \in H^s_{\geq i}(X;\delta)\}.$$

Thus $V^*_{N-1}(X;\delta) = Od(\Pi_N)$.

9. For $2 \leq i \leq N-1$, $\alpha \in U^*_i(X;\delta) :\Leftrightarrow \forall \beta\{\alpha \preceq_i \beta < \pi \Rightarrow \beta \in U_{\geq i}(X;\delta)\}$.

10. For $2 \leq i \leq N-1$, $UV^*_i(X;\delta) := U^*_i(X;\delta) \cap V^*_i(X;\delta)$.

11. For $2 \leq i \leq N-1$, $\alpha \in U_i(X) :\Leftrightarrow \alpha \in U_i(X;\alpha)$.
$\alpha \in V^s_i(X)$, $\alpha \in H^s_{\geq i}(X)$, $\alpha \in V^*_i(X)$, $\alpha \in U^*_i(X)$ and $\alpha \in UV^*_i(X)$ are defined similarly by diagonalizations.

12.

$$\alpha \in V^*(X) :\Leftrightarrow \alpha \in V^*_2(X) \,\&\, \mathcal{C}^\alpha(X)|\alpha \subseteq V^*_2(X).$$

Cf. Lemmata 6.11 and 6.12.4 for the added condition $\mathcal{C}^\alpha(X)|\alpha \subseteq V^*_2(X)$.

13. $V\mathcal{C}^\alpha(X) := V^*(X) \cap \mathcal{C}^\alpha(X)$.

Lemma 6.3 *1. For $i < N-1$, $V^*_i(X;\delta) \subseteq V^*_{i+1}(X;\delta) \cap H^s_{\geq i}(X;\delta)$ and $H^s_i(X;\delta) \subseteq V^s_i(X;\delta)$.*

$T(X;\delta) \ni \alpha \prec_i \beta \Rightarrow \beta \in T(X;\delta)$ for $i \leq N-1$ and $T \in \{V^*_i, UV^*_i\}$.

2. $\bigcup\{K_\sigma\nu : \nu = st_i(\delta), i \leq N-1, \sigma \leq rg_i(\delta)\} < \gamma$ *for* $\mathcal{D}^Q \ni \gamma \preceq \delta$.

3. *Assume* $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathcal{X} \,\&\, \alpha \leq \beta$*. Then* $T(\mathcal{Y};\alpha) \subseteq T(\mathcal{X};\beta)$ *for* $T \in \{U_i, U_i^*\}$ *and* $T(\mathcal{Y};\alpha) \supseteq T(\mathcal{X};\beta)$ *for* $T \in \{V_i^s, H_i^s, V_i^*\}$*, and hence* $V_2^*(\mathcal{Y}) \supseteq V_2^*(\mathcal{X})$*,* $V^*(\mathcal{Y}) \supseteq V^*(\mathcal{X})$*.*

4. *For any classes* $\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y} \subseteq Od(\Pi_N)$ *enjoying the condition* **(A)** *in Definition 3.3, i.e.,* $\forall\alpha \in \mathcal{X}[\alpha \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha(\mathcal{X})]$ *the following holds:*

$$\mathcal{X}|\alpha = \mathcal{Y}|\alpha \Rightarrow \forall\beta < \alpha^+\{V\mathcal{C}^\beta(\mathcal{X})|\beta^+ = V\mathcal{C}^\beta(\mathcal{Y})|\beta^+\}.$$

Proof.
6.3.1. $V_i^*(X;\delta) \subseteq V_{i+1}^*(X;\delta)$ follows from Lemma 4.16.2.
6.3.2. Put $Y := \bigcup\{K_\sigma\nu : \nu = st_i(\delta), i \leq N-1, \sigma \leq rg_i(\delta)\}$. Then $Y < \delta = \delta^-$ follows from the condition (27) of $(\mathcal{D}.2)$ in Definition 4.14. Since $\ell Y < \ell\delta$, we have $K_\delta Y = \emptyset$, and hence $Y < \gamma$ follows from Lemma 2.2.3.
6.3.3. $V_i^s(\mathcal{Y};\alpha) \supseteq V_i^s(\mathcal{X};\beta)$ is seen from $U_i(\mathcal{Y};\alpha) \subseteq U_i(\mathcal{X};\beta)$. Using this and $V_{N-1}^*(\mathcal{X};\delta) = Od(\Pi_N)$ for any $\mathcal{X}$ and δ, we see $T(\mathcal{Y};\alpha) \supseteq T(\mathcal{X};\beta)$ for $T \in \{H_i^s, V_i^*\}$ by induction on $N-i$.
6.3.4. Let $\beta < \alpha^+$, and $\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}$ enjoy the condition **(A)** with $\mathcal{X}|\alpha = \mathcal{Y}|\alpha$. We have $\beta^- \leq \alpha$, and hence $U_i(\mathcal{X};\beta) = U_i(\mathcal{Y};\beta)$ for any i. Therefore $H_i^s(\mathcal{X};\beta) = H_i^s(\mathcal{Y};\beta)$. This means that $V_2^*(\mathcal{X})|\beta^+ = V_2^*(\mathcal{Y})|\beta^+$. Finally consider $V\mathcal{C}^\alpha(X)$. By Lemmata 3.5.2 and 3.2 we have $\mathcal{C}^\beta(\mathcal{X}) = \mathcal{C}^\alpha(\mathcal{X}) = \mathcal{C}^\alpha(\mathcal{Y}) = \mathcal{C}^\beta(\mathcal{Y})$. Hence $V^*(\mathcal{X})|\beta^+ = V^*(\mathcal{Y})|\beta^+$ and $V\mathcal{C}^\beta(\mathcal{X})|\beta^+ = V\mathcal{C}^\beta(\mathcal{Y})|\beta^+$ for any $\beta < \alpha^+$. □

Remark 6.4 Lemma 6.3.4 is needed for us to ensure the one of the most basic properties of distinguished classes $\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}$:

$$\alpha \leq \mathcal{X} \,\&\, \alpha \leq \mathcal{Y} \Rightarrow \mathcal{X}|\alpha^+ = \mathcal{Y}|\alpha^+.$$

Here is the reason why we have restricted the sets $U_i(X;\delta)$ and $V_i^s(X;\delta)$ to δ^-. If the restriction is absent, say $V_i^s(X) := V_i^s(X;\pi)$, we would have $V_2^*(\mathcal{X})|\alpha^+ \neq V_2^*(\mathcal{Y})|\alpha^+$ even if $\mathcal{X}|\alpha = \mathcal{Y}|\alpha$ since for some $\gamma > \alpha$, $\alpha \prec \beta \,\&\, \gamma \prec \beta$ and hence we could have, e.g., $\gamma \in U_i(\mathcal{X}) \,\&\, \gamma \notin U_i(\mathcal{Y})$.

On the other side the upward requirement $\beta \in H_{\geq i}^s(X;\delta)$ for any β with $\alpha \preceq_i \beta < \pi$ in Definition 6.2.8 of $V_i^*(X;\delta)$ will be used in Claim 6.27 and Theorem 6.33.

Definition 6.5 For $X, Y \subseteq Od(\Pi_N)$ and $\alpha \in Od(\Pi_N)$,

1. $D[X] :\Leftrightarrow X < \pi \,\&\, \forall\alpha(\alpha \leq X \to WV\mathcal{C}^\alpha(X)|\alpha^+ = X|\alpha^+)$.
   A class $\mathcal{X}$ is said to be a *distinguished class* if $D[\mathcal{X}]$. A *distinguished set* is a set which is a distinguished class.

2. $\mathcal{W}_D := \bigcup\{X|\pi : D[X]\}$.

Observe that $V\mathcal{C}^\alpha(X)$ is Π^1_1 in X, $WV\mathcal{C}^\alpha(X)$ is Π^1_1 in $\Pi^1_1(X)$ and hence $D[X]$ is Δ^1_2 in X. Thus $\mathcal{W}_D$ is Σ^1_2 and hence a proper class. $\mathcal{W}_D$ would exist as a set if we assume Σ^{1-}_2-CA.

Obviously any distinguished class $\mathcal{X}$ enjoys the condition **(A)** $\forall\alpha \in \mathcal{X}[\alpha \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha(\mathcal{X})]$ in Definition 3.3.

Lemma 6.6 $D[X] \,\&\, \alpha \in X \Rightarrow \forall\beta[\alpha \in V^*(X) \cap \mathcal{C}^\beta(X)]$.

Proof. Assume $D[X] \,\&\, \alpha \in X$. Then $\alpha \in X|\alpha^+ = WV\mathcal{C}^\alpha(X) \subseteq V^*(X) \cap \mathcal{C}^\alpha(X)$. Hence $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}^\beta(X)$ for any $\beta \leq \alpha$ by Lemma 3.5.1. Moreover for $\beta > \alpha$ we have $\alpha \in X|\beta \subseteq \mathcal{C}^\beta(X)$. □

In the following Lemmata 6.7 and 6.8, $\mathcal{I}$ denotes a class family of distinguished classes, i.e., $\forall X \in \mathcal{I}\, D[X]$. Set

$$\mathcal{W}_\mathcal{I} = \bigcup\{X \in \mathcal{I} : D[X]\}.$$

The following Lemmata 6.7, 6.8, 6.9 and 6.10 are seen as in [2] from Lemma 6.3.4 and 6.6.

Lemma 6.7 *$D[X] \,\&\, X \in \mathcal{I} \,\&\, \alpha \leq X \Rightarrow \mathcal{W}_\mathcal{I}|\alpha^+ = X|\alpha^+$.*

Lemma 6.8 *$D[\mathcal{W}_\mathcal{I}]$. In paricular $D[\mathcal{W}_D]$.*

Lemma 6.9 *$TI[\mathcal{W}_D]$.*

Lemma 6.10 *Suppose $D[X]$, $\alpha \in \mathcal{G}(X) \cap V^*(X)$ and*

$$\forall\beta(X < \beta \,\&\, \beta^+ < \alpha^+ \Rightarrow WV\mathcal{C}^\beta(X)|\beta^+ \subseteq X) \tag{36}$$

Then $\alpha \in WV\mathcal{C}^\alpha(X)|\alpha^+ \,\&\, D[WV\mathcal{C}^\alpha(X)|\alpha^+]$.

Lemma 6.11 *Let X be a distinguished set. Assume $\gamma \in V^*(X)$, $X|\gamma \subseteq \mathcal{G}(X)$ and $\alpha < \gamma \,\&\, \forall\sigma \leq \gamma[K_\sigma\alpha \subseteq X]$. Then $\mathcal{C}^\alpha(X)|\alpha \subseteq V_2^*(X)$.*

Proof. We show by induction on $\ell\beta$ that

$$\beta \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha(X)|\alpha \Rightarrow \beta \in \mathcal{C}^\gamma(X)|\gamma.$$

On the other hand we have $\mathcal{C}^\gamma(X)|\gamma \subseteq V_2^*(X)$ by $\gamma \in V^*(X)$. Hence $\mathcal{C}^\alpha(X)|\alpha \subseteq V_2^*(X)$ follows.

If $\beta \in X$, then $\beta \in \mathcal{C}^\gamma(X)$ follows from Lemma 6.6. If $\beta \notin \mathcal{D}$, then $\beta \in \mathcal{C}^\gamma(X)$ is seen from IH. Assume $\beta \in \mathcal{D}_\sigma$ with a $\sigma > \alpha$.

First consider the case $\gamma < \sigma$. Then $\forall\kappa \leq \gamma[K_\kappa\beta < \beta < \alpha]$ by Lemma 2.2.5. Lemma 3.6.1 with IH yields $\beta \in \mathcal{C}^\gamma(X)|\gamma$.

Finally assume $\alpha < \sigma \leq \gamma$. Then pick a $\delta \in K_\sigma\alpha \subseteq X|(\alpha+1)$ such that $\beta \leq \delta \in X|\gamma$ by Lemmata 2.2.4 and 2.2.3. We claim $\beta \in X$. Then $\beta \in \mathcal{C}^\gamma(X)$ follows from Lemma 6.6 again. Assume $\beta < \delta$. We have $\delta \in \mathcal{G}(X)$, and hence $\beta \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha(X)|\delta \subseteq \mathcal{C}^\delta(X)|\delta \subseteq X$ by Lemma 3.5.1. We are done. □

Lemma 6.12 *Let X be a distinguished set. Assume $\gamma \in X$.*

1. *$\forall\beta \in X|\gamma\forall\sigma[\alpha \in \mathcal{C}^\beta(X) \Rightarrow K_\sigma\alpha \subseteq \mathcal{C}^\beta(X)]$.*
2. *$\alpha \in X|\gamma \Rightarrow \forall\sigma(K_\sigma\alpha \subseteq X)$.*
3. *$\alpha \in \mathcal{C}^\gamma(X) \Rightarrow \forall\sigma \leq \gamma(K_\sigma\alpha \subseteq X)$.*

4. $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}^{\gamma}(X)|\gamma \Rightarrow \alpha \in X$.

Therefore

$$D[X] \Rightarrow X \subseteq \mathcal{G}(X).$$

Proof. By main induction on $\gamma \in X$ with subsidiary induction on $\ell\alpha$ we show these simultaneously.
6.12.1. Let $\beta \in X|\gamma$ and $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}^{\beta}(X)$. If $\alpha \in X|\beta$, then $K_{\sigma}\alpha \subseteq X$ by MIH on Lemma 6.12.2. Hence $K_{\sigma}\alpha \subseteq \mathcal{C}^{\beta}(X)$ by Lemma 6.6. Otherwise the assertion follows from SIH. For example if $\alpha \in \mathcal{D}_{\rho}$ with $\rho > \beta$, then $\{\rho\} \cup c(\alpha) \subseteq \mathcal{C}^{\beta}(X)$. SIH yields $K_{\sigma}\alpha \subseteq \{\alpha\} \cup K_{\sigma}(\{\rho\} \cup c(\alpha)) \subseteq \mathcal{C}^{\beta}(X)$.
6.12.2. Assume $\alpha \in X|\gamma$. Then $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}^{\alpha}(X)$, and hence $K_{\sigma}\alpha \subseteq \mathcal{C}^{\alpha}(X)$ by Lemma 6.12.1. We can assume $K_{\sigma}\alpha < \alpha$ by Lemma 2.2.4. Then $K_{\sigma}\alpha \subseteq \mathcal{C}^{\alpha}(X)|\alpha \subseteq X$ by MIH on Lemma 6.12.4.
6.12.3. Assume $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}^{\gamma}(X)$ and $\sigma \leq \gamma$. If $\alpha \in X|\gamma$, then Lemma 6.12.2 yields $K_{\sigma}\alpha \subseteq X$. Otherwise the assertion follows from SIH. For example if $\alpha \in \mathcal{D}_{\rho}$ with $\rho > \gamma \geq \sigma$, then $\alpha \not\prec \sigma$ and $\{\rho\} \cup c(\alpha) \subseteq \mathcal{C}^{\gamma}(X)$. SIH yields $K_{\sigma}\alpha \subseteq K_{\sigma}(\{\rho\} \cup c(\alpha)) \subseteq X$.
6.12.4. Assume $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}^{\gamma}(X)|\gamma$. We show $\alpha \in X$. We have $WV\mathcal{C}^{\gamma}(X)|\gamma^{+} = X|\gamma^{+} \,\&\, \gamma \in V^{*}(X)$ by $\gamma \in X$. Thus it suffices to show $\alpha \in V^{*}(X)$. By $\gamma \in V^{*}(X)$ we have $\alpha \in V_{2}^{*}(X)$. On the other hand we have $\forall\sigma \leq \gamma[K_{\sigma}\alpha \subseteq X]$ by Lemma 6.12.3, and $X|\gamma \subseteq \mathcal{G}(X)$ by MIH on Lemma 6.12.4. Consequently Lemma 6.11 yields $\mathcal{C}^{\alpha}(X)|\alpha \subseteq V_{2}^{*}(X)$, and hence $\alpha \in V^{*}(X)$. We are done. □

Thus $\theta[X] :\Leftrightarrow D[X]$ enjoys these hypotheses $(\boldsymbol{\theta}.\mathbf{i})(i \leq 2)$ in Subsection 3.2 Therefore by Lemmata 3.15.2, 3.15.3, 3.4 and 1.2 we have the conditions **(K)** $\forall\tau[\alpha \in \mathcal{X} \Rightarrow K_{\tau}\alpha \subseteq \mathcal{X}]$, **(KC)** $\forall\alpha\forall\beta\forall\sigma[\alpha \in \mathcal{C}^{\beta}(\mathcal{X}) \,\&\, \sigma \leq \beta \Rightarrow K_{\sigma}\alpha \subseteq \mathcal{X}]$, $\forall\beta\forall\tau[\alpha \in \mathcal{C}^{\beta}(X) \Rightarrow K_{\tau}\alpha \subseteq \mathcal{C}^{\beta}(X)]$ and $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{X})$ for any $\mathcal{X} \in \{X : D[X]\} \cup \{\mathcal{W}_{D}\}$.

Lemma 6.13 *Let X be a distinguished set, and suppose*

$$\eta \in \mathcal{G}(X) \cap V^{*}(X) \tag{37}$$

and

$$\forall\gamma \prec \eta(\gamma \in \mathcal{G}(X) \cap V^{*}(X) \to \gamma \in X) \tag{38}$$

Then

$$\eta \in WV\mathcal{C}^{\eta}(X)|\eta^{+} \,\&\, D[WV\mathcal{C}^{\eta}(X)|\eta^{+}].$$

Proof. By Lemma 6.10 and the hypothesis (37) it suffices to show

$$\forall\beta(X < \beta \,\&\, \beta^{+} < \alpha^{+} \Rightarrow WV\mathcal{C}^{\beta}(X)|\beta^{+} \subseteq X) \tag{36}$$

Assume $X < \beta \,\&\, \beta^{+} < \eta^{+}$. We have to show $WV\mathcal{C}^{\beta}(X)|\beta^{+} \subseteq X$. We prove this by induction on $\gamma \in WV\mathcal{C}^{\beta}(X)|\beta^{+}$. Suppose $\gamma \in V\mathcal{C}^{\beta}(X)|\beta^{+}$ and $V\mathcal{C}^{\beta}(X)|\gamma \subseteq X$. We show $\gamma \in X$.

We show first

$$\gamma \in \mathcal{G}(X).$$

First $\gamma \in V\mathcal{C}^{\gamma}(X)$ by $\gamma \in V\mathcal{C}^{\beta}(X)|\beta^{+}$. Second we show the following claim by induction on $\ell\alpha$:

Claim 6.14 $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}^{\gamma}(X)|\gamma \Rightarrow \alpha \in X$.

Proof of Claim 6.14. We have $\alpha \in V_2^*(X)$ by $\gamma \in V^*(X)$, and $\alpha \in V^*(X)$ by Lemmata 6.11, 6.12.4 and **(KC)** for X. Therefore we can assume $\gamma^+ \leq \beta$ by $V\mathcal{C}^{\beta}(X)|\gamma \subseteq X$.

First consider the case $\alpha \not\in \mathcal{D}$. Then Lemma 3.6.1 with IH yields $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}^{\beta}(X)$. Hence $\alpha \in V\mathcal{C}^{\beta}(X)|\gamma \subseteq X$.

Therefore we can assume $\alpha \in \mathcal{D}_{\rho}$ for some $\rho > \gamma$. Then $\{\rho\} \cup c(\alpha) \subseteq \mathcal{C}^{\gamma}(X)$.
Case1. $\beta < \rho$: Then $\forall \kappa \leq \beta[K_{\kappa}(\{\rho\} \cup c(\alpha)) = K_{\kappa}\alpha < \alpha < \gamma]$. Hence Lemma 3.6.1 with IH yields $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}^{\beta}(X)$ and $\alpha \in V\mathcal{C}^{\beta}(X)|\gamma \subseteq X$.
Case2. $\beta \geq \rho$: We have $\mathcal{D}_{\rho} \ni \alpha < \gamma < \rho \leq \beta$. Pick a $\delta \in K_{\rho}\gamma$ such that $\alpha \leq \delta \leq \gamma$ by Lemma 2.2.3. $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}^{\beta}(X)$ with **(KC)** yields $V\mathcal{C}^{\delta}(X) \ni \alpha \leq \delta \in X$. Therefore $\alpha \in WV\mathcal{C}^{\delta}(X)|\delta^+ = X|\delta^+$.

Thus Claim 6.14 was shown. □

Hence we have $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}(X) \cap V^*(X)$. We have $\gamma < \beta^+ \leq \eta \,\&\, \gamma \in \mathcal{C}^{\gamma}(X)$. If $\gamma \prec \eta$, then the hypothesis (38) yields $\gamma \in X$. In what follows assume $\gamma \not\prec \eta$.

If $\forall \kappa \leq \eta[K_{\kappa}\gamma < \gamma]$, then Lemma 3.6.2 yields $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}^{\eta}(X)|\eta \subseteq X$ by $\eta \in \mathcal{G}(X)$.

Suppose $\exists \kappa \leq \eta[K_{\kappa}\gamma = \{\gamma\}]$. This means that $\gamma \in \mathcal{D}$ and $\exists \kappa < \eta[\gamma \prec \kappa]$ by $\gamma \not\prec \eta$. Let τ denote the maximal such one. Then $\tau \in \mathcal{C}^{\gamma}(X) \,\&\, \gamma < \tau < \eta \,\&\, \forall \kappa \leq \eta[K_{\kappa}\tau < \gamma]$ by Lemmata 3.10.1, 2.2.3 and 2.2.5. Lemma 3.6.2 yields $\tau \in \mathcal{C}^{\eta}(X)|\eta \subseteq X$ by $\eta \in \mathcal{G}(X)$. Therefore $\tau \in X < \beta$. $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}^{\beta}(X)$ with **(KC)** yields $\{\gamma\} = K_{\tau}\gamma \subseteq X$. We are done. □

Thus $\theta[X] :\Leftrightarrow D[X]$ enjoys these hypotheses **(θ.i)**$(i \leq 4)$ in Subsection 3.2 (demonstrably in the set theory KPM+V=L of recursively Mahlo universes with the axiom of constructibility). Here note that we have $\alpha \in V^*(X)$ for any X and any $\alpha \not\in \mathcal{D}^Q$.

6.2 Mahlo universes

In this subsection we introduce several classes of Mahlo universes and establish key facts on these classes. This is a crux in showing $Od(\Pi_N)$ to be wellfounded without assuming the existence of the maximal distinguished class $\mathcal{W}_D$.

From Theorem 2.4 in p.315 of [11] we know that there exists a Π_3-sentence *ad* such that z is admissible iff $(z; \in) \models ad$. Put

$$lmtad :\Leftrightarrow \forall x \exists y (x \in y \,\&\, ad^y)$$

Observe that *lmtad* is a Π_2-sentence. Let *Lmtad* denote the class of limits of admissible sets in a whole universe.

Definition 6.15 *1.* By a *universe* we mean either a whole universe L with $(\mathrm{L}; \in) \models \mathrm{KP}\Pi_N$ or a transitive set $Q \in \mathrm{L}$ in a whole universe L such that $\omega \in Q$. Universes are denoted $P, Q, \ldots$

2. For a universe P and a set-theoretic sentence φ, $P \models \varphi :\Leftrightarrow (P; \in) \models \varphi$.

3. A universe P is said to be a *limit universe* if $lmtad^P$ holds, i.e., P is a limit of admissible sets.

4. For a universe P, $\Delta_0(\Delta_1)$ *in* P denotes the class of predicates which are Δ_0 in some Δ_1 predicates on P.

5. L denotes a whole universe L with $(\mathrm{L}; \in) \models \mathrm{KP}\Pi_N$.

Lemma 6.16 *Let P be a limit universe and $X \in \mathcal{P}(\omega) \cap P$.*

1. *$V^*(X)$ and $WV\mathcal{C}^\alpha(X)$ are Δ_1 and $D[X]$ is $\Delta_0(\Delta_1)$.*

2. *$V^*(X) = \{\alpha : P \models \alpha \in V^*(X)\}$, $WV\mathcal{C}^\alpha(X) = \{\alpha : P \models \alpha \in WV\mathcal{C}^\alpha(X)\}$ and $D[X] \Leftrightarrow P \models D[X]$.*

Definition 6.17 For a limit universe P set

$$\mathcal{W}^P = \bigcup\{X \in P : D[X]\} = \bigcup\{X \in P : P \models D[X]\}.$$

Thus $\mathcal{W}^{\mathrm{L}} = \mathcal{W}_D$ for the whole universe L.

Lemma 6.18 *For any limit universe P*

$$D[\mathcal{W}^P].$$

Proof. This follows from Lemma 6.8. □

Lemma 6.19 *For limit universes P, Q,*

$$Q \in P \Rightarrow \mathcal{W}^Q \subseteq \mathcal{W}^P \,\&\, \mathcal{W}^Q \in P.$$

Lemma 6.20 *For any limit universe P*

$$\beta \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha(\mathcal{W}^P) \leftrightarrow \exists X \in P\{D[X] \,\&\, \beta \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha(X)\}.$$

Proof. By the monotonicity of $\mathcal{C}^\alpha(X)$ we have the direction $[\leftarrow]$.

The converse direction $[\rightarrow]$ is seen by induction on $\ell\beta$ using the fact $\{X_i\}_{i<n} \subseteq P \,\&\, \forall i < n D[X_i] \Rightarrow \bigcup_{i<n} X_i \in P \,\&\, D[\bigcup_{i<n} X_i]$. □

The following lemma is seen as in Lemma 6.20 using Lemma 6.3.3.

Lemma 6.21 *For any limit universe P*

$$\alpha \in U_i^*(\mathcal{W}^P; \delta) \rightarrow \exists X \in P\{D[X] \,\&\, \alpha \in U_i^*(X; \delta)\}.$$

Some preparatory definitions are introduced. We say that a class $\mathcal{X} \subseteq Lmtad$ is a Π_n-*class* for $n \geq 2$ if there exists a set-theoretic Π_n-formula $F(\bar{a})$ with parameters $\bar{a}$ such that for any set P with $\bar{a} \subseteq P$

$$P \in \mathcal{X} \Leftrightarrow (P; \in) \models F(\bar{a}) \wedge lmtad.$$

Thus $P \in \mathcal{X}$ is a Δ_0-formula. For a whole universe L, $\mathrm{L} \in \mathcal{X}$ denotes the formula $F(\bar{a})$.

By a Π^1_0-*class* we mean a Π_n-class for some $n \geq 2$.

Referring [11], pp.322-327 let $\Pi_i(a)\,(i > 0)$ denote a universal Π_i-formula uniformly on admissibles. Set

$$P \in M_i(\mathcal{X}) :\Leftrightarrow P \in Lmtad \,\&\, \forall b \in P[P \models \Pi_i(b) \rightarrow \exists Q \in \mathcal{X} \cap P(Q \models \Pi_i(b))].$$

Observe that $M_i(\mathcal{X})$ is a Π_{i+1}-class if $\mathcal{X}$ is Π^1_0-class.

Lemma 6.22 *Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a Π^1_0-class such that $\mathcal{X} \subseteq Lmtad$. Suppose $P \in M_2(\mathcal{X})$ and $\alpha \in \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{W}^P)$. Then there exists a universe $Q \in \mathcal{X}$ such that $\alpha \in \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{W}^Q)$.*

Proof. Suppose $P \in M_2(\mathcal{X})$ and $\alpha \in \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{W}^P)$.

First by $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha(\mathcal{W}^P)$ and Lemma 6.20 pick a distinguished set $X_0 \in P$ so that $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha(X_0)$

Next writing $\mathcal{C}^\alpha(\mathcal{W}^P)|\alpha \subseteq \mathcal{W}^P$ analytically we have

$$\forall\beta < \alpha[\beta \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha(\mathcal{W}^P) \Rightarrow \exists Y \in P(D[Y] \,\&\, \beta \in Y)]$$

Again by Lemma 6.20 we have

$$\beta \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha(\mathcal{W}^P) \leftrightarrow \exists X \in P\{D[X] \,\&\, \beta \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha(X)\}.$$

Thus we have

$$\forall\beta < \alpha\forall X \in P\exists Y \in P[(D[X] \,\&\, \beta \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha(X)) \Rightarrow (D[Y] \,\&\, \beta \in Y)].$$

By Lemma 6.16.2 we have $D[X] \leftrightarrow P \models D[X]$ for any $X \in P$. Hence by Lemma 6.16.1 the following Π_2-predicate holds in the universe $P \in M_2(\mathcal{X})$:

$$\forall\beta < \alpha\forall X\exists Y[(D[X] \,\&\, \beta \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha(X)) \Rightarrow (D[Y] \,\&\, \beta \in Y)] \tag{39}$$

Now pick a universe $Q \in P \cap \mathcal{X}$ such that $X_0 \in Q$, $Q \models (39)$. Tracing the above argument backwards in the limit universe Q we have $\mathcal{C}^\alpha(\mathcal{W}^Q)|\alpha \subseteq \mathcal{W}^Q$ and $X_0 \subseteq \mathcal{W}^Q = \bigcup\{X \in Q : Q \models D[X]\} \in P$. Thus by Lemma 6.20 we have $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha(\mathcal{W}^Q)$. Hence $\alpha \in \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{W}^Q)$. □

In the following key Definition 6.23 we define Π_N-classes $M[\eta, i; \alpha]\,(2 \leq i \leq N-1)$ and Π_{i+1}-classes $M(\eta, i; \alpha)\,(2 \leq i < N-1)$ by induction on $N - i$ for $\eta \in \mathcal{D}^Q$ and $\alpha \in Od(\Pi_N)|\pi$, cf. Subsections 4.3, 4.4 and Remark 6.4.

Definition 6.23 Let $2 \leq i \leq N-1$.

1. $P \in M[\eta, N-1; \alpha]$ iff $P \in Lmtad$ and
$$P \in \bigcap\{M_{N-1}(M[\gamma, N-1; \alpha]) : U^*_{N-1}(\mathcal{W}^P; \alpha) \ni \gamma \prec_{N-1} \eta\}.$$
2. For $2 \leq i < N-1$, $P \in M(\eta, i; \alpha)$ iff $P \in Lmtad \,\&\, i \in In(\eta)$ and
$$P \in \bigcap\{M_i(M[\gamma, i; \alpha]) : U^*_i(\mathcal{W}^P; \alpha) \ni \gamma \lhd^s_i \eta\}.$$
3. For $2 \leq i < N-1$,
$$P \in M[\eta, i; \alpha] :\Leftrightarrow P \in M[\eta, i+1; \alpha] \cap M_i(\mathcal{X}(\eta^0_i, i; \alpha))$$
where $\mathcal{X}(\eta, i; \alpha)$ denotes the class
$$\mathcal{X}(\eta, i; \alpha) := M[\eta, i+1; \alpha] \cap \bigcap\{M(\eta^m_i, i; \alpha) : m < lh_i(\eta) - 1\}.$$
Note that
$$\mathcal{X}(\eta^0_i, i; \alpha) = M[\eta^0_i, i+1; \alpha] \cap \bigcap\{M(\eta^m_i, i; \alpha) : m < lh_i(\eta) - 1\}.$$

4. $M[\eta, 2] := M[\eta, 2; \eta]$.

Let us examine how these classes are defined for a fixed α. Note that $U_i^*(\mathcal{W}^P; \alpha)$ is Σ_1 on P. First $M[\eta, N-1; \alpha]$ is defined as a Π_N-class using a recursion lemma, cf. [11], pp.322-327. Namely there exists a primitive recursive function $g^{[N-1]}(\eta; \alpha)$ such that

$$P \in M[\eta, N-1; \alpha] \Leftrightarrow P \models \Pi_N(g^{[N-1]}(\eta; \alpha)).$$

Suppose that Π_N-classes $M[\gamma, i+1; \alpha]$ has been defined for any γ and let $g^{[i+1]}(\gamma; \alpha)$ be a primitive recursive function such that

$$P \in M[\gamma, i+1; \alpha] \Leftrightarrow P \models \Pi_N(g^{[i+1]}(\gamma; \alpha)).$$

Then $M(\eta, i; \alpha)$ and $M[\eta, i; \alpha]$ are defined as a Π_{i+1}-class and a Π_N-class, resp. using the function $g^{[i+1]}$ and a simultaneous recursion lemma.

We say that a universe P is an *η-Mahlo universe* if $P \in M[\eta, 2]$.

Now we show that if P is an η-Mahlo universe and $UV_2^*(\mathcal{W}^P) \ni \gamma \prec \eta$, then P is Π_2-reflecting on γ-Mahlo universes, i.e., $P \in M_2(M[\gamma, 2])$, cf. Theorem 6.29.

Lemma 6.24 *If $\alpha < \beta$, then $M[\eta, i; \beta] \subseteq M[\eta, i; \alpha]$ for $2 \leq i \leq N-1$.*

Proof. Assume $\alpha < \beta$. Then $U_i^*(\mathcal{X}; \alpha) \subseteq U_i^*(\mathcal{X}; \beta)$ for any classes $\mathcal{X}$. By induction on $\in$ with subsidiary induction on $N - i$ show simultaneously

$$P \in M[\eta, i; \beta] \Rightarrow P \in M[\eta, i; \alpha]\, (2 \leq i \leq N-1),$$

and

$$P \in M(\eta, i; \beta) \Rightarrow P \in M(\eta, i; \alpha)\, (2 \leq i < N-1).$$

□

Lemma 6.25 *Assume $P \in M_{i+1}(M[\eta, i+1; \alpha])$, and either $P \in M_i(\mathcal{X}(\eta_i^0, i; \alpha))$ or $\eta = \eta_i^0$ & $P \in \bigcap\{M(\eta_i^m, i; \alpha) : m < lh_i(\eta) - 1\}$. Then $P \in M_i(M[\eta, i; \alpha])$.*

Proof.

First consider the case when $P \in M_{i+1}(M[\eta, i+1; \alpha]) \cap M_i(\mathcal{X}(\eta_i^0, i; \alpha))$. Since $M_i(\mathcal{X}(\eta_i^0, i; \alpha))$ is a Π_{i+1}-class, P reflects it on $M[\eta, i+1; \alpha]$. Namely we have with $M[\eta, i; \alpha] = M[\eta, i+1; \alpha] \cap M_i(\mathcal{X}(\eta_i^0, i; \alpha))$, $P \in M_{i+1}(M[\eta, i; \alpha]) \subseteq M_i(M[\eta, i; \alpha])$.

Next consider the case when $P \in M_{i+1}(M[\eta, i+1; \alpha]) \cap \bigcap\{M(\eta_i^m, i; \alpha) : m < lh_i(\eta) - 1\}$ and $\eta = \eta_i^0$. By the first case it suffices to show $P \in M_i(\mathcal{X}(\eta_i^0, i; \alpha))$ with the class

$$\mathcal{X}(\eta_i^0, i; \alpha) = M[\eta_i^0, i+1; \alpha] \cap \bigcap\{M(\eta_i^m, i; \alpha) : m < lh_i(\eta) - 1\}.$$

Since $M(\eta_i^m, i; \alpha)$ are Π_{i+1}-classes, P reflects these on $M[\eta_i^0, i+1; \alpha] = M[\eta, i+1; \alpha]$. Namely we have $P \in M_{i+1}(\mathcal{X}(\eta_i^0, i; \alpha)) \subseteq M_i(\mathcal{X}(\eta_i^0, i; \alpha))$. We are done.

□

The following is the key lemma.

Lemma 6.26 1. *Suppose* $2 \leq i \leq N-1$, $pd_i(\gamma) = \eta$ *and* $\gamma \in UV_i^*(\mathcal{W}^P;\alpha)$. *Then for any* class P

$$P \in M[\eta, i; \alpha] \Rightarrow P \in M_i(M[\gamma, i; \alpha]).$$

2. *Suppose* $N-1 > i \in In(\gamma) \,\&\, \gamma \in H_i^s(\mathcal{W}^P;\alpha) \,\&\, \eta = \gamma_i^1$. *Then for any* set P

$$P \in \mathcal{X}(\eta, i; \alpha) \Rightarrow P \in M(\gamma, i; \alpha)$$

with $\mathcal{X}(\eta, i; \alpha) = M[\eta, i+1; \alpha] \cap \bigcap\{M(\eta_i^m, i; \alpha) : m < lh_i(\eta) - 1\}$.

Proof. These are shown simultaneously by induction on $N-i$. First we show Lemma 6.26.1 for the case $i = N-1$. Second Lemma 6.26.2 is shown assuming Lemma 6.26.1 for the case $i+1$. Finally Lemma 6.26.1 is proved assuming Lemma 6.26.2.

6.26.1 for the case $i = N-1$ follows from the definition of $P \in M[\eta, N-1; \alpha]$. Namely we have

$$U_{N-1}^*(\mathcal{W}^P;\alpha) \ni \gamma \prec_{N-1} \eta \,\&\, P \in M[\eta, N-1; \alpha] \Rightarrow P \in M_{N-1}(M[\gamma, N-1; \alpha]).$$

In what follows assume $i < N-1$. First we show the following claim.

Claim 6.27 *Assume Lemma 6.26.1 holds for an* $i < N-1$. *Then the hypothesis* $pd_i(\gamma) = \eta$ *can be weakened to* $\gamma \prec_i \eta$ *as follows: Suppose* $\gamma \prec_i \eta$ *and* $\gamma \in UV_i^*(\mathcal{W}^P;\alpha)$. *Then*

$$P \in M[\eta, i; \alpha] \Rightarrow P \in M_i(M[\gamma, i; \alpha]).$$

Proof of Claim 6.27. This is seen from Lemmata 6.3.1, 6.3.3 and 6.21, and the fact $M_i(M_i(\mathcal{X})) \subseteq M_i(\mathcal{X})$. □

6.26.2. Suppose $i \in In(\gamma) \,\&\, \gamma \in H_i^s(\mathcal{W}^P;\alpha)$. We show $P \in M(\gamma, i; \alpha)$ by subsidiary induction on $\gamma \in V_i^s(\mathcal{W}^P;\alpha)$ for *sets* P assuming $P \in \mathcal{X}(\eta, i; \alpha)$ for the diagram $\eta = \gamma_i^1 = (rg_i(\gamma))_i^0$. Note that the relation $\lhd_i^s$ is transitive.

Assume $U_i^*(\mathcal{W}^P;\alpha) \ni \delta \lhd_i^s \gamma$. Then $\delta \in V_i^s(\mathcal{W}^P;\alpha) \cap UV_{i+1}^*(\mathcal{W}^P;\alpha)$ by $\gamma \in H_i^s(\mathcal{W}^P;\alpha)$, and $rg_i(\delta) = rg_i(\gamma)$ and hence $\delta_i^1 = \eta$. By Lemma 4.21 and Definition 4.20 we have $\forall m[0 < m < lh_i(\delta) - 1 \Rightarrow \delta_i^m = \eta_i^{m-1}]$ and $\delta_i^0 = \delta$ since $i \in In(\delta)$.

We have to show $P \in M_i(M[\delta, i; \alpha])$. By Lemma 6.25 and $\delta_i^0 = \delta$ it suffices to show the following claim.

Claim 6.28 1. $P \in M_{i+1}(M[\delta, i+1; \alpha])$.

2. $P \in \bigcap\{M(\delta_i^m, i; \alpha) : m < lh_i(\delta) - 1\}$.

Proof of Claim 6.28.

6.28.1. By $\delta_i^1 = \eta$ and Lemma 4.22 we have $\delta = \delta_i^0 \prec_{i+1} \eta$. We have $P \in \mathcal{X}(\eta, i; \alpha) \subseteq M[\eta, i+1; \alpha]$. Therefore Claim 6.27 and IH on Lemma 6.26.1 for

the case $i+1$ yield Claim 6.28.1.
6.28.2. First consider the case $m > 0$. Then we have $\delta_i^m = \eta_i^{m-1}$ and $P \in \mathcal{X}(\eta, i; \alpha) \subseteq M(\eta_i^{m-1}, i; \alpha) = M(\delta_i^m, i; \alpha)$. On the other side $P \in M(\delta, i; \alpha)$ follows from SIH. Thus Claim 6.28.2 was shown. □

6.26.1 for the case $i < N-1$. Suppose $pd_i(\gamma) = \eta$, $\gamma \in UV_i^*(\mathcal{W}^P; \alpha)$ and $P \in M[\eta, i; \alpha]$. We have to show $P \in M_i(M[\gamma, i; \alpha])$.

By Lemma 4.24 one of the following cases occur:

Case 4.24.1

$$\eta = pd_i(\gamma) = pd_{i+1}(\gamma) \,\&\, lh_i(\gamma) = lh_i(\eta) \,\&\, \forall m < lh_i(\gamma)[\gamma_i^m = \eta_i^m]$$

$\gamma \in UV_{i+1}^*(\mathcal{W}^P; \alpha)$ and $P \in M[\eta, i; \alpha] \subseteq M[\eta, i+1; \alpha]$. Thus by IH we have $P \in M_{i+1}(M[\gamma, i+1; \alpha])$, and hence by Lemma 6.25 it suffices to show $P \in M_i(\mathcal{X}(\gamma_i^0, i; \alpha))$. This follows from $\gamma_i^0 = \eta_i^0$ and $P \in M[\eta, i; \alpha] \subseteq M_i(\mathcal{X}(\eta_i^0, i+1; \alpha))$.

In what follows assume $i \in In(\gamma)$.

Case 4.24.2

$$rg_i(\gamma) = pd_i(\gamma) = \eta \,\&\, \gamma_i^0 = \gamma \,\&\, \forall m < lh_i(\eta) = lh_i(\gamma) - 1[\eta_i^m = \gamma_i^{1+m}]$$

Then $\gamma = \gamma_i^0 \prec_{i+1} \gamma_i^1 = \eta_i^0$. We have $P \in M[\eta, i; \alpha] \subseteq M_i(\mathcal{X}(\eta_i^0, i; \alpha))$ with

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \mathcal{X}(\eta_i^0, i; \alpha) & = & \mathcal{X}(\gamma_i^1, i; \alpha) \\ & = & M[\gamma_i^1, i+1; \alpha] \cap \bigcap \{M(\gamma_i^m, i; \alpha) : 0 < m < lh_i(\gamma) - 1\}. \end{array}$$

Let Q be any limit universe in P such that $Q \in \mathcal{X}(\gamma_i^1, i; \alpha)$ and $\gamma \in U_{i+1}^*(\mathcal{W}^Q; \alpha)$, cf. Lemma 6.21. We claim that $Q \in M_i(M[\gamma, i; \alpha])$. This yields

$$P \in M_i(\mathcal{X}(\gamma_i^1, i; \alpha)) \subseteq M_i(M_i(M[\gamma, i; \alpha])) \subseteq M_i(M[\gamma, i; \alpha]),$$

and hence we are done. By the definition we have

$$Q \in M[\gamma_i^1, i+1; \alpha] \tag{40}$$

$$Q \in \bigcap \{M(\gamma_i^m, i; \alpha) : 0 < m < lh_i(\gamma) - 1\} \tag{41}$$

By Lemma 6.19 we have $\mathcal{W}^Q \subseteq \mathcal{W}^P$, and hence

$$\gamma \in UV_{i+1}^*(\mathcal{W}^Q; \alpha) \tag{42}$$

and

$$\gamma \in H_i^s(\mathcal{W}^Q; \alpha) \tag{43}$$

On the other hand we have $\gamma \prec_{i+1} \gamma_i^1$. Therefore IH on Lemma 6.26.1, i.e., Claim 6.27 with (40) and (42) yields

$$Q \in M_{i+1}(M[\gamma, i+1; \alpha]) \tag{44}$$

On the other side Lemma 6.26.2 with the *set* $Q \in \mathcal{X}(\gamma_i^1, i; \alpha)$ and (43) yields $Q \in M(\gamma, i; \alpha)$. Hence we have by (41)

$$Q \in \bigcap\{M(\gamma_i^m, i; \alpha) : m < lh_i(\gamma) - 1\} \tag{45}$$

Now Lemma 6.25 with $\gamma_i^0 = \gamma$, (44) and (45) yields $Q \in M_i(M[\gamma, i; \alpha])$ as desired.

Case 4.24.3

$$\begin{aligned}
&\eta = pd_i(\gamma) \prec_i rg_i(\gamma) \,\&\, \gamma_i^0 = \gamma \,\& \\
&\exists m[0 < m \leq lh_i(\eta) - 1 \,\&\, rg_i(\eta_i^{m-1}) = rg_i(\gamma) \,\&\, st_i(\eta_i^{m-1}) > st_i(\gamma) \,\& \\
&\forall k < lh_i(\eta) - m + 1 = lh_i(\gamma)(k > 0 \to \eta_i^{m-1+k} = \gamma_i^k)]
\end{aligned}$$

Then we have $U_i^*(\mathcal{W}^P; \alpha) \ni \gamma \lhd_i^s \eta_i^{m-1}$ for an m with $0 < m \leq lh_i(\eta) - 1$. $P \in M[\eta, i; \alpha] \subseteq M(\eta_i^{m-1}, i; \alpha)$ yields $P \in M_i(M[\gamma, i; \alpha])$. $\Box$

Lemma 6.26.1, i.e., Claim 6.27 yields the following Theorem 6.29.

Theorem 6.29 *Let P be an η-Mahlo universe. Then P is Π_2-reflecting on γ-Mahlo universes for $UV_2^*(\mathcal{W}^P) \ni \gamma \prec \eta$:*

$$P \in M[\eta, 2] \,\&\, UV_2^*(\mathcal{W}^P) \ni \gamma \prec \eta \Rightarrow P \in M_2(M[\gamma, 2]).$$

Proof. By Lemma 6.24 we have $P \in M[\eta, 2] = M[\eta, 2; \eta] \subseteq M[\eta, 2; \gamma]$. On the other hand we have $\gamma \in UV_2^*(\mathcal{W}^P; \gamma)$. Thus Lemma 6.26.1, i.e., Claim 6.27 yields $P \in M_2(M[\gamma, 2; \gamma])$. $\Box$

Lemma 6.30 $\mathcal{G}(X) \subseteq U_2^*(X)$.

Proof. Assume $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}(X)$. Let $\delta \in \mathcal{D}^Q$ such that $\gamma \preceq \delta$ and $\nu = st_i(\delta)$ for an $i \geq 2$. We have to show $Y := \bigcup\{K_\sigma \nu : \sigma \leq rg_i(\delta)\} \subseteq X|\gamma$. By Lemma 6.3.2 we have $Y < \gamma$.

On the other hand we have $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}^\gamma(X)$, and this yields $\delta \in \mathcal{C}^\gamma(X)$, and hence $\nu \in \mathcal{C}^\gamma(X)$ by the definition of the set $\mathcal{C}^\gamma(X)$. Therefore $Y \subseteq \mathcal{C}^\gamma(X)$ follows from Lemma 3.15.3. Thus we have $Y \subseteq \mathcal{C}^\gamma(X)|\gamma \subseteq X$. $\Box$

Theorem 6.31 *For any* set P *and* η

$$\eta \in \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{W}^P) \cap V^*(\mathcal{W}^P) \,\&\, P \in M_2(M[\eta, 2]) \Rightarrow \eta \in \mathcal{W}^P$$

Proof. We show this by induction on $\in$. Suppose, as IH, the theorem holds for any limit universe $Q \in P$. By Lemma 6.22 pick a $Q \in P$ so that for $X = \mathcal{W}^Q \in P$, $\eta \in \mathcal{G}(X) \,\&\, Q \in M[\eta, 2]$. By Lemma 6.3.3 we also have $\eta \in V^*(X)$. Hence we have

$$\eta \in \mathcal{G}(X) \cap V^*(X) \tag{37}$$

On the other side Lemma 6.30 and Theorem 6.29 yield

$$\forall \gamma \prec \eta\{\gamma \in \mathcal{G}(X) \cap V^*(X) \Rightarrow Q \in M_2(M[\gamma, 2])\}.$$

Now IH yields

$$\forall\gamma \prec \eta(\gamma \in \mathcal{G}(X) \cap V^*(X) \to \gamma \in X) \tag{38}$$

Therefore by Lemmata 6.18 and 6.13 we conclude

$$\eta \in WV\mathcal{C}^{\eta}(X)|\eta^+ \in P \,\&\, D[WV\mathcal{C}^{\eta}(X)|\eta^+]$$

and hence $\eta \in \mathcal{W}^P$. □

Now we establish the existence of η-Mahlo universes for each η. Here the Π_N-reflection of the whole universe enters proofs.

Recall that $\mathcal{W}_\pi = \mathcal{C}^\pi(\mathcal{W}^{\mathrm{L}})$.

Lemma 6.32 *Let* L *be a whole universe such that* $\mathrm{L} \models \mathrm{KP}\Pi_N$, *and* $\eta \in \mathcal{D}^Q$. *For each* $n \in \omega$, *if* $b(\eta) < \omega_n(\pi+1)$, *then*

$$\forall\gamma \in \mathcal{D}^Q\{\eta \preceq \gamma \in U^*_{N-1}(\mathcal{W}^L;\eta) \Rightarrow \mathrm{L} \in M[\gamma, N-1;\eta]\}.$$

Proof. Let $\eta \preceq \gamma \in \mathcal{D}^Q$.

First we show

$$\eta \preceq \gamma \in U^*_{N-1}(\mathcal{W}^{\mathrm{L}};\eta) \Rightarrow st_{N-1}(\gamma) \in \mathcal{W}_\pi|\omega_n(\pi+1) \tag{46}$$

By Lemmata 4.19 and 2.4 we have $st_{N-1}(\gamma) \leq Q(\gamma) \leq \max\{b(\gamma), \pi\} \leq \max\{b(\eta), \pi\} < \omega_n(\pi+1)$.

On the other side $\gamma \in U^*_{N-1}(\mathcal{W}^{\mathrm{L}};\eta)$ means that $\forall\beta[\gamma \preceq_{N-1} \beta \Rightarrow \beta \in U_{N-1}(\mathcal{W}^{\mathrm{L}};\eta)]$. In particular $\bigcup\{K_\sigma\nu : \sigma \leq \pi\} \subseteq \mathcal{W}^{\mathrm{L}}$ with $\nu = st_{N-1}(\gamma)$. Therefore Lemma 3.11 with the condition ($\mathcal{D}$.2) (27) in Definition 4.14 yields $\nu \in \mathcal{C}^\pi(\mathcal{W}^{\mathrm{L}}) = \mathcal{W}_\pi$. Thus we have shown (46).

We show that $\forall\gamma \in U^*_{N-1}(\mathcal{W}^{\mathrm{L}};\eta)\{\eta \preceq \gamma \Rightarrow \mathrm{L} \in M[\gamma, N-1;\eta]\}$ by induction on $st_{N-1}(\gamma) \in \mathcal{W}_\pi$ up to each $\omega_n(\pi+1)$, cf. (46) and Lemma 3.20.5. Suppose $\eta \preceq \gamma \in U^*_{N-1}(\mathcal{W}^{\mathrm{L}};\eta)$.

$\mathrm{L} \in M[\gamma, N-1;\eta]$ is equivalent to

$$\forall\delta \in U^*_{N-1}(\mathcal{W}^{\mathrm{L}};\eta)\forall b(\delta \prec_{N-1} \gamma \,\&\, \mathrm{L} \models \Pi_{N-1}(b) \Rightarrow$$
$$\exists Q(b \in Q \,\&\, Q \models \Pi_{N-1}(b) \,\&\, Q \in M[\delta, N-1;\eta]).$$

Suppose $\delta \in U^*_{N-1}(\mathcal{W}^{\mathrm{L}};\eta) \,\&\, \delta \prec_{N-1} \gamma \,\&\, \mathrm{L} \models \Pi_{N-1}(b)$ for a b. Then $st_{N-1}(\delta) < st_{N-1}(\gamma)$ by Lemma 4.15.

By IH, $\Pi_{N-1}(b) \wedge \mathrm{L} \in M[\delta, N-1;\eta]$ holds in L. Since this is a Π_N-formula, Π_N-reflection for the whole universe L yields $\exists Q(b \in Q \,\&\, Q \models \Pi_{N-1}(b) \,\&\, Q \in M[\delta, N-1;\eta])$. □

Theorem 6.33 *For each* $n \in \omega$

$$\forall\eta \in U^*_{N-1}(\mathcal{W}^L) \cap V^*_2(\mathcal{W}^L) \cap \mathcal{D}^Q[b(\eta) < \omega_n(\pi+1) \Rightarrow \mathrm{L} \in M[\eta, 2]].$$

Proof. Assume $\eta \in U^*_{N-1}(\mathcal{W}^{\mathrm{L}}) \cap V^*_2(\mathcal{W}^{\mathrm{L}})$ and $b(\eta) < \omega_n(\pi+1)$ for an $\eta \in \mathcal{D}^Q$. We show the

Claim 6.34 *1.* $\eta \preceq \gamma < \pi \Rightarrow \mathrm{L} \in M_i(\mathcal{X}(\gamma, i; \eta))$ *for* $i < N - 1$.

2. $\eta \preceq \gamma < \pi \Rightarrow \mathrm{L} \in M[\gamma, i; \eta]$ *for* $i \leq N - 1$.

Proof of Claim 6.34 by simultaneous induction on $\ell\gamma$ with subsidiary induction on $N - i$. Suppose $\eta \preceq \gamma < \pi$.

First $\gamma \in U^{*}_{N-1}(\mathcal{W}^{\mathrm{L}}; \eta)$ and hence by Lemma 6.32 we have $\mathrm{L} \in M[\gamma, N-1; \eta]$, i.e., Claim 6.34.2 for the case $i = N-1$ follows. In what follows assume $i < N-1$. 6.34.1. First by SIH we have $\mathrm{L} \in M[\gamma, i+1; \eta] \cap \bigcap\{M[\gamma_i^{m+1}, i+1; \eta] : m < lh_i(\gamma) - 1\}$. By reflecting Π_N-classes $M[\gamma, i+1; \eta]$ and $M[\gamma_i^{m+1}, i+1; \eta]$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{L} &\in M_N(M[\gamma, i+1; \eta] \cap \bigcap\{M[\gamma_i^{m+1}, i+1; \eta] : m < lh_i(\gamma) - 1\}) \\ &\subseteq M_i(M[\gamma, i+1; \eta] \cap \bigcap\{M[\gamma_i^{m+1}, i+1; \eta] : m < lh_i(\gamma) - 1\}). \end{aligned}$$

Let $\mathrm{L} \models \Pi_i(b)$ for a b. Pick a *set* P in L such that $P \in M[\gamma, i+1; \eta] \cap \bigcap\{M[\gamma_i^{m+1}, i+1; \eta] : m < lh_i(\gamma) - 1\}$, $P \models \Pi_i(b)$ and $\eta \in V_2^{*}(\mathcal{W}^P; \eta)$ by Lemma 6.3.3. We claim that

$$P \in \mathcal{X}(\gamma, i; \eta) = M[\gamma, i+1; \eta] \cap \bigcap\{M(\gamma_i^m, i; \eta) : m < lh_i(\gamma) - 1\}.$$

This yields $\mathrm{L} \in M_i(\mathcal{X}(\gamma, i; \eta))$ as desired.

Now we show that $P \in M(\gamma_i^m, i; \eta)$ by reverse induction on $m < lh_i(\gamma) - 1$. Suppose $P \in \bigcap\{M(\gamma_i^{m+1+k}, i; \eta) : k < lh_i(\gamma) - m - 2\}$ and put $\delta = \gamma_i^m$. We have to show $P \in M(\delta, i; \eta)$. By Lemma 4.21 $\delta_i^1 = \gamma_i^{m+1}$, $lh_i(\delta_i^1) = lh_i(\gamma) - m - 1$ and $\forall k < lh_i(\delta_i^1)[(\delta_i^1)_i^k = \delta_i^{1+k} = \gamma_i^{m+1+k}]$. Therefore we have $P \in \mathcal{X}(\delta_i^1, i; \eta) = M[\gamma_i^{m+1}, i+1; \eta] \cap \bigcap\{M(\gamma_i^{m+1+k}, i; \eta) : k < lh_i(\gamma) - m - 2\}$. On the other hand we have $\delta \in H_i^s(\mathcal{W}^P; \eta)$ by $\eta \preceq \delta$ and $\eta \in V_2^{*}(\mathcal{W}^P; \eta)$. Consequently Lemma 6.26.2 yields $P \in M(\delta, i; \eta)$ for the set P. We are done.
6.34.2. By SIH we have $\mathrm{L} \in M[\gamma, i+1; \eta]$. Also by Claim 6.34.1 we have $\mathrm{L} \in M_i(\mathcal{X}(\gamma_i^0, i; \eta))$. Therefore $\mathrm{L} \in M[\gamma, i+1; \eta] \cap M_i(\mathcal{X}(\gamma_i^0, i; \eta)) = M[\gamma, i; \eta]$.

Thus we have shown Claim 6.34. □

Claim 6.34.2 for the case $\gamma = \eta \,\&\, i = 2$ yields $\mathrm{L} \in M[\eta, 2]$. □

Now we conclude the following theorem.

Theorem 6.35 *For each* $n \in \omega$

$$\forall \eta \in \mathcal{D}[\eta \in \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{W}^L) \cap V^{*}(\mathcal{W}^L) \,\&\, b(\eta) < \omega_n(\pi + 1) \Rightarrow \eta \in \mathcal{W}^L].$$

Proof. Without loss of generality we can assume $\eta \in \mathcal{D}^Q$ by Lemmata 6.13 and 6.22. Assume $\eta \in \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{W}^{\mathrm{L}}) \cap V^{*}(\mathcal{W}^{\mathrm{L}}) \,\&\, b(\eta) < \omega_n(\pi + 1)$. By Lemma 6.30 and Theorem 6.33 we have $\mathrm{L} \in M[\eta, 2]$ and hence $\mathrm{L} \in M_2(M_2(M[\eta, 2]))$. By Lemma 6.22, pick a limit universe P such that $\eta \in \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{W}^P) \cap V^{*}(\mathcal{W}^P) \,\&\, P \in M_2(M[\eta, 2])$. Then Theorem 6.31 yields $\eta \in \mathcal{W}^P \subseteq \mathcal{W}^{\mathrm{L}}$. □

6.3 Wellfoundedness proof (concluded)

In this subsection we show $\{\sigma\} \cup c(\alpha_1) \subseteq \mathcal{W}_\pi \Rightarrow \alpha_1 \in \mathcal{W}^{\mathrm{L}}$ for each $\alpha_1 \in \mathcal{D}$. Thus a proof of Theorem 6.1 is completed.

By Theorem 6.35, cf. Lemma 5.11, we have for each $\alpha \in Od(\Pi_N)|\pi$,

$$\alpha \in \mathcal{G} \cap V^* \Rightarrow \alpha \in \mathcal{W}^{\mathrm{L}}$$

for

$$\mathcal{G} := \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{W}^{\mathrm{L}}) \text{ and } V^* := V^*(\mathcal{W}^{\mathrm{L}}).$$

Proof of Lemma 4.11 for $\mathcal{W}^{\mathrm{L}}$. We have to show for each $n \in \omega$

$$\forall \alpha \in \mathcal{W}_\pi|\omega_n(\pi+1) \forall q \subseteq \mathcal{W}_\pi|\omega_n(\pi+1) A(\alpha, q).$$

By main induction on $\alpha \in \mathcal{W}_\pi|\omega_n(\pi+1)$ with subsidiary induction on $q \subseteq \mathcal{W}_\pi|\omega_n(\pi+1)$. Here observe that if $\beta_1 \in \mathcal{D}$ with $b(\beta_1) < \omega_n(\pi+1)$, then by Lemma 4.19 we have $Q(\beta_1) \leq \max\{b(\beta_1), \pi\} < \omega_n(\pi+1)$.

Let $\alpha_1 \in \mathcal{D}_\sigma$ with $\sigma \in \mathcal{W}_\pi$ and $\alpha = b(\alpha_1) \,\&\, q = Q(\alpha_1)$. By Theorem 3.23 we have $\alpha_1 \in \mathcal{G}$. We show $\alpha_1 \in \mathcal{W}^{\mathrm{L}}$. By Theorem 6.35 it suffices to show $\alpha_1 \in V^*$. We have $\sigma \in V^* \cup \{\pi\}$ by $\sigma \in \mathcal{W}_\pi$. We show the following claim.

Claim 6.36 *Let* $2 \leq i < N-1$.

1. $\mathcal{C}^{\alpha_1}(\mathcal{W}^L)|\alpha_1 \subseteq V_2^*(\mathcal{W}^L)$.
2. $\sigma \preceq \beta < \pi \Rightarrow \beta \in H^s_{\geq 2}(\mathcal{W}^L; \alpha_1)$.
3. $\eta \preceq \alpha_1 \,\&\, \eta \in U_i(\mathcal{W}^L; \alpha_1) \,\&\, \alpha_1 \prec rg_i(\eta)\downarrow \Rightarrow \eta \in V_i^s(\mathcal{W}^L; \alpha_1)$.
4. $\eta \preceq \alpha_1 \,\&\, \alpha_1 \prec rg_i(\eta)\downarrow \Rightarrow \eta \in H_i^s(\mathcal{W}^L; \alpha_1)$.

Proof of Claim 6.36.
6.36.1. $\mathcal{C}^{\alpha_1}(\mathcal{W}^{\mathrm{L}})|\alpha_1 \subseteq V_2^*(\mathcal{W}^{\mathrm{L}})$ follows from $\alpha_1 \in \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{W}^{\mathrm{L}})$.
6.36.2. If $\sigma \preceq \beta < \pi$, then $\sigma \in V_2^*(\mathcal{W}^{\mathrm{L}}; \sigma)$ yields $\beta \in H^s_{\geq 2}(\mathcal{W}^{\mathrm{L}}; \sigma) \subseteq H^s_{\geq 2}(\mathcal{W}^{\mathrm{L}}; \alpha_1)$ by Lemma 6.3.3.
6.36.3. Assume $\eta \preceq \alpha_1 \,\&\, \eta \in U_i(\mathcal{W}^{\mathrm{L}}; \alpha_1) \,\&\, \alpha_1 \prec rg_i(\eta)\downarrow$ for an $i < N-1$. We show

$$st_i(\eta) \in \mathcal{W}_\pi|\omega_n(\pi+1) \tag{47}$$

We have $\gamma \lhd_i^s \eta \Rightarrow st_i(\gamma) < st_i(\eta)$ for $\sigma \preceq rg_i(\gamma) = rg_i(\eta)$. Therefore by induction on $st_i(\eta) \in \mathcal{W}_\pi|\omega_n(\pi+1)$ we see $\eta \in V_i^s(\mathcal{W}^{\mathrm{L}}; \alpha_1)$.

Put $\nu = st_i(\eta)$ and $\tau = rg_i(\eta)$. By Lemma 4.18.6 and $i < N-1$ we have $\nu = st_i(\eta) < \pi$. Thus we have shown $st_i(\eta) < \omega_n(\pi+1)$.

On the other hand we have $\eta \in U_i(\mathcal{W}^{\mathrm{L}}; \alpha_1)$. Namely $\bigcup\{K_\kappa \nu : \kappa \leq \tau\} \subseteq \mathcal{W}^{\mathrm{L}}$.

Hence Lemma 3.11 with the condition ($\mathcal{D}$.2) (27) in Definition 4.14 yields

$$\nu \in \mathcal{C}^\tau(\mathcal{W}^{\mathrm{L}}) \tag{48}$$

By Lemmata 4.18.6 and 2.4 we have

$$\mathcal{B}_{>\tau}(\nu) < \alpha \tag{49}$$

Now Lemma 3.22 together with MIH(α), (48) and (49) yields $\nu \in \mathcal{C}^{\pi}(\mathcal{W}^{\rm L}) = \mathcal{W}_{\pi}$. This shows (47).

6.36.4 by induction on $N - i$.

Assume $\eta \preceq \alpha_1 \,\&\, \alpha_1 \prec rg_i(\eta)\downarrow$ for an $i < N-1$. Let $U_i(\mathcal{W}^{\rm L}; \alpha_1) \ni \gamma \lhd_i^s \eta$. We show $\gamma \in V^*_{i+1}(\mathcal{W}^{\rm L}; \alpha_1) \cap V_i^s(\mathcal{W}^{\rm L}; \alpha_1)$.

First by Claim 6.36.3 we have $\gamma \in V_i^s(\mathcal{W}^{\rm L}; \alpha_1)$.

Next suppose $\gamma \prec_{i+1} \beta < \pi$. Then $\alpha_1 \prec rg_i(\eta) = rg_i(\gamma) \preceq_i pd_{i+1}(\gamma) \preceq_{i+1} \beta$ by ($\mathcal{D}$.11) in Definition 4.14. Hence $\sigma \preceq \beta$, and Claim 6.36.2 yields $\beta \in H^s_{\geq i+1}(\mathcal{W}^{\rm L}; \alpha_1)$.

Finally Lemma 4.18.5 with $i \in In(\gamma)$ yields $\alpha_1 \prec rg_i(\gamma) \preceq_i rg_j(\gamma)$ for any $j \geq i+1$ with $rg_j(\gamma)\downarrow$. Therefore $\gamma \in H^s_{\geq i+1}(\mathcal{W}^{\rm L}; \alpha_1)$ by IH. Consequently $\gamma \in V^*_{i+1}(\mathcal{W}^{\rm L}; \alpha_1)$.

This shows Claim 6.36. □

Now by Claim 6.36.4 we have $\alpha_1 \in H^s_{\geq 2}(\mathcal{W}^{\rm L})$. On the other hand we have $\alpha_1 \prec \beta < \pi \Rightarrow \beta \in H^s_{\geq 2}(\mathcal{W}^{\rm L}; \alpha_1)$ by Claim 6.36.2, and hence $\alpha_1 \in V_2^*(\mathcal{W}^{\rm L}; \alpha_1)$. Thus Claim 6.36.1 yields $\alpha_1 \in V^*$.

This completes a proof of Lemma 4.11 for $\mathcal{W}^{\rm L}$. □

Lemma 4.11 yields Lemma 4.12: $\alpha_1 \in \mathcal{W}_{\pi}$ for each $\alpha_1 \in Od(\Pi_N)$ as in [8].

Consequently Lemma 3.18 yields Theorem 6.1.

References

[1] T. Arai, A system $(O(\pi_n), <)$ of ordinal diagrams, handwritten note, Apr. 1994.

[2] T. Arai, Ordinal diagrams for recursively Mahlo universes, Archive for Mathematical Logic 39 (2000) 353-391.

[3] T. Arai, Ordinal diagrams for Π_3-reflection, Journal of Symbolic Logic 65 (2000) 1375-1394.

[4] T. Arai, Ordinal diagrams for Π_N-reflection, draft.

[5] T. Arai, Proof theory for theories of ordinals I:recursively Mahlo ordinals, Annals of Pure and Applied Logic vol. 122 (2003), pp. 1-85.

[6] T. Arai, Proof theory for theories of ordinals II:Π_3-Reflection, Annals of Pure and Applied Logic vol. 129 (2004), pp. 39-92.

[7] T. Arai, Proof theory for reflecting ordinals III:Π_N-reflection, submitted.

[8] T. Arai, Wellfoundedness proofs by means of non-monotonic inductive definitions I: Π^0_2-operators, Journal of Symbolic Logic vol. 69 (2004), pp. 830-850.

[9] W. Buchholz, Normalfunktionen und konstruktive Systeme von Ordinalzahlen. In: Diller, J., Müller, G.H.(eds.) Proof Theory Symposion, Kiel 1974 (Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol.500, pp.4-25). Berlin: Springer 1975

[10] W. Buchholz, Review of the paper: A. Setzer, Well-ordering proofs for Martin-Löf type theory, Bulletin of Symbolic Logic 6 (2000) 478-479.

[11] W.H. Richter and P. Aczel, Inductive definitions and reflecting properties of admissible ordinals, Generalized Recursion Theory, Studies in Logic, vol.79, North-Holland, 1974, pp.301-381.

[12] A. Setzer, Well-ordering proofs for Martin-Löf type theory, Annals of Pure and Applied Logic vol. 92 (1998), pp. 113-159.

[13] A. Setzer, Review of the paper [8], MR2078925 (2005h:03105) .